



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2016

Remember the Word That I Told You: Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John

Jeffrey Michael Tripp
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tripp, Jeffrey Michael, "Remember the Word That I Told You: Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John" (2016). *Dissertations*. 2154.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2154

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2016 Jeffrey Michael Tripp

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

“REMEMBER THE WORD THAT I TOLD YOU”:
DIRECT INTERNAL QUOTATION IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN THEOLOGY

BY
JEFFREY M. TRIPP

CHICAGO, IL

AUGUST 2016

Copyright by Jeffrey M. Tripp, 2016
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish first of all to thank the department of theology at Loyola University Chicago for admitting me to the program and for providing financial support in the form of a research assistantship. I am also grateful to have been given the opportunity to teach in the department while working on my dissertation. I also wish to acknowledge the department's former Graduate Programs Director and my former professor, Dr. Wendy Cotter, for her advice, her teaching, and her guidance as I begin my career. Additionally my thanks go to Catherine Wolf for too many things to list.

I certainly wish to acknowledge my dissertation committee, Drs. Robert A. Di Vito, Thomas H. Tobin, and director Edmondo F. Lupieri for their remarkable insight, generosity, and professionalism. Dr. Tobin has been a careful reader throughout this process, paying close attention to my writing and taking the time to discuss with me not only the finer points of my arguments, but also their clarity and flow. Dr. Di Vito saved the project from severe delay by agreeing to join after much of the dissertation was written—despite having recently taken on (again) the role of Graduate Programs Director. And I wish to express my sincerest and most deeply felt gratitude to Dr. Lupieri. He has been an exemplary mentor since I began at Loyola, as his assistant and his student, and he has ever since pushed me to be a better scholar, to ask new and different questions, and to try to understand how the writers I study viewed their world(s). I am especially grateful that Dr. Lupieri has taken over as director of my

committee when he has many other responsibilities, and that he has continued to be so very generous and considerate with his time.

My wife, Marian, should get considerably more credit for the completion of this project than I can give her here. She has tolerated books and papers piled on her floors and furniture for years with barely a word said about it (unless it came down to a choice between the books and having a meal at our kitchen table). She has always encouraged me, has let me use her as a sounding board after a full day at work, and cheered me on through setbacks. That takes grit, lady. I love you.

And last but not least, my dog, Zoey, has spent countless hours (literally, she can't count) lying next to me while I research and write. Many insights and solutions to problems were discovered while taking her for walks, and she has been a remarkably good listener throughout the project, never complaining that she has no idea who Aelius Theon is or what an altered state of consciousness might be. Although she was quite verbal about some of my louder music: she's a Chopin girl apparently.

For Marian

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | viii |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| A Definition of Direct Internal Quotation | 1 |
| Previous Works on DIQ in the Gospel of John and Other Biblical Texts | 11 |
| The Present Plan of Study | 31 |
| CHAPTER 2: JOHN'S DIRECT INTERNAL QUOTATIONS IN THEIR LITERARY CONTEXTS | 45 |
| DIQ in the Context of <i>Paraphrasis</i> | 45 |
| An Example from Plato's <i>Protagoras</i> | 56 |
| Paraphrase in the Gospel of John | 64 |
| Transposition in Greco-Roman and Jewish Contexts | 71 |
| Transposition in the Gospel of John | 73 |
| Addition in Greco-Roman and Jewish Contexts | 86 |
| Addition in the Gospel of John | 88 |
| Subtraction in Greco-Roman and Jewish Contexts | 92 |
| Subtraction in the Gospel of John | 94 |
| Substitution in Greco-Roman and Jewish Contexts | 104 |
| Substitution in the Gospel of John | 109 |
| Conclusion | 119 |
| CHAPTER 3: THE ROLES OF DIQ IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL | 122 |
| Part I: Direct Internal Quotation and Functional Redundancy in John | 123 |
| A Case Study in Redundancy: Where Jesus Is Going | 129 |
| Part II: Direct Internal Quotation and the Johannine Trial Motif | 133 |
| Direct Internal Quotation in Forensic Defenses: Plato's <i>Apology</i> | 142 |
| Direct Internal Quotation in Novelistic Trial Scenes: Achilles Tatius' <i>Leucippe and Clitophon</i> | 147 |
| Direct Internal Quotation as a Forensic Marker in the Old Testament | 153 |
| Direct Internal Quotation as a Forensic Marker in the New Testament | 155 |
| Direct Internal Quotation as a Device in the Trial Motif of the Fourth Gospel | 171 |
| CHAPTER 4: DIRECT INTERNAL QUOTATION AS A MEANS OF INCORPORATING AND DEVELOPING TRADITIONAL MATERIAL | 189 |
| A Brief Case Study: <i>The Acts of Pilate</i> | 192 |
| Traditional Material in the Fourth Gospel | 199 |
| The Testimony of John the Baptist | 199 |
| You Blaspheme; I Am God's Son (John 10:36) | 217 |
| I Am the Jews' King (John 19:21) | 218 |

| | |
|--|---------|
| I Am (John 18:5, 6, 8) | 220 |
| It Is Better for One Person to Die for the People (John 11:50-52; 18:14) | 221 |
| The Son of Man Must Be Lifted Up (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32-34) | 224 |
| A Slave Is not Greater than His Master (John 13:16; 15:20) | 226 |
| Rise, Carry Your Bed and Walk (John 5:8, 11-12) | 232 |
| If You Remain in My Word, You Will Truly Be My Disciples, and You Will Know the Truth, and the Truth Will Free You (John 8:31-33) | 235 |
| A Prophet Does not Have Honor in His Own Fatherland (John 4:44) | 241 |
| You Have a Demon (John 7:20; 8:48) | 243 |
| I Am Coming to You (John 14:3, 18, 28) | 244 |
| Unless Someone Is Born from Above, He Cannot See the Kingdom of God (John 3:3, 7) | 247 |
| If Anyone Keeps My Word, He Will Never See Death Forever (John 8:51-52) | 253 |
| If I Want Him to Remain until I Come, What Is That to You? (John 21:22-23) | 257 |
| Speculations on Other Possibly Pre-Johannine Material | 259 |
| Common Phrases Incorporated through DIQ | 261 |
| Conclusion | 265 |
| CHAPTER 5: DIRECT INTERNAL QUOTATION AND THE COSMIC MOVEMENTS OF JESUS | 278 |
| Introduction | 278 |
| Final and Realized Eschatology | 281 |
| Jesus Comes and Jesus Goes, Part I: Outsiders | 291 |
| Yet a Little Time I Am with You (ἔτι χρόνον μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι) | 292 |
| I Go to the One who Sent Me (ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με) | 297 |
| You Will Seek Me and You Will not Find [Me] (ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσετε [με]) | 298 |
| Where I Am, You Cannot Come (ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν) | 302 |
| Jesus Comes and Jesus Goes, Part II: Insiders | 307 |
| Conclusion | 338 |
| APPENDIX: GRAMMATICAL AND TEXTUAL ISSUES | 346 |
| General Grammatical Considerations | 347 |
| DIQ and Text-Critical Issues in the Gospel of John | 357 |
| The Problem of John 14:2 | 375 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 380 |
| VITA | 408 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 1. Direct Internal Quotation in Past Scholarship | 35 |
| Table 2. Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John | 39 |
| Table 3. The Paraphrases of Pittacus and Simonides in <i>Prot.</i> 339a-347a | 64 |
| Table 4. Cases of Inverted Word Order in DIQ | 70 |
| Table 5. Direct Internal Quotations in the Narrative Books of the New Testament | 183 |
| Table 6. <i>Acts of Pilate</i> and the New Testament Using DIQ | 197 |
| Table 7. Statements Quoted by John the Baptist with Synoptic Parallels | 200 |
| Table 8. The Synoptic Sanhedrin Trial and John's Dedication Scene | 219 |
| Table 9. The Extent of John's Paraphrase with Scripture and in DIQ | 271 |
| Table 10. Summary of Quoted Johannine Statements with Outside Parallels | 276 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

על כן משפט כל החכמים בכל לשון שישמרו הטעמים, ואינם חוששים משנוי המלות אחר שהם שוות בטעמן
והנה אמר אליעזר הגמליאני נא. והוא אמר ואומר אליה השקיני נא.

Who would be foolish enough to think that the meaning is not identical because the words have been changed? Also, Eliezer said, “Please let me sip,” but he said, “And I said, ‘Please give me to drink’.”

Ibn Ezra, *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (Exod 20:1)¹

πότε δὲ τοῦτο εἶπεν αὐτοῖς; εἰκὸς τοῦτο ῥηθῆναι μὲν μὴ γραφῆναι δέ.

But when did he say this to them? Something like this was spoken but not written.

Euthymius Zigabenus, *Commentary on John* (6:36)²

A Definition of Direct Internal Quotation

The character of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel has a lot to say. His speech tends to dominate in dialogue scenes,³ and he gives discourses that can go on for long stretches at

¹ Allan R. Benyowitz, trans. and ed., *Translation of Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: A.R. Benyowitz, 2006), 2:554-55. Ibn Ezra (12th century) is attempting to reconcile the variant wording of the Decalogue between Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 (where it is quoted by Moses rather than the narrator), and he gives several examples of direct internal quotations that fail to match exactly (here Gen 24:17, 45). Ibn Ezra is cited by George W. Savran (*Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative* [ISBL; Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988], 1-2) who provides the translation. Savran cites another 12th century commentator, David Kimchi, who comments on the same speech by Abraham's servant: “we cannot give any reasons for the numerous omissions and additions... These are only changes in wording; the meaning remains the same.”

² Jacques-Paul Migne, ed., *Patrologiae Graecae* (161 vols.; Paris: 1857-1866), 129:604 col. 1248. Cited in T. Francis Glasson, “Inaccurate Repetitions in the Fourth Gospel,” *ExpT* 57 (1946): 111-12 (here 111). Euthymius is likewise from the 12th century; despite this rhetorical question and the answer given, he moves on quickly and gives little indication that Jesus' lack of verbal precision is a cause for concern.

³ Even in Pontius Pilate's final private scene with Jesus (John 19:8-12), in which Pilate asks Jesus, “Are you not speaking to me?” Jesus gets 21 words to Pilate's 18.

a time with little to no interruption.⁴ Furthermore Jesus draws particular attention to the importance of his words by asserting that he only speaks what he has heard from his Father (John 12:49-50). One must not only believe his words to attain eternal life (5:24; 6:63, 68), one must *keep* them (8:51-52; 14:23-24).⁵ In its strongest sense, the gospel declares the importance of Jesus' spoken message by portraying him as the incarnation of God's Word from the opening verses (1:1-4).

A separate, stylistic feature of the Gospel of John is the tendency toward repetition, often coupled with variation. In John 6, for example, Jesus repeats the refrain "I will raise him/it on the last day" four times in close succession with minor variations (6:39, 40, 44, 54). Pilate declares Jesus to be innocent three times (18:38; 19:4, 6). Peter not only denies Jesus three times (18:15-18, 25-27), he must answer the question posed by Jesus three times, "Do you love me?" before Jesus allows him back into the fold and in fact makes him shepherd (21:15-19). On the final occasion the narrator acknowledges that it is the third time that Jesus asks this question, and furthermore takes the time to comment on Peter's grief that Jesus has asked him three times (ἐλυπήθη ὁ Πέτρος ὅτι εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον, φιλεῖς με;).⁶ We will return to this verse in more detail below.

⁴ Among the longest are the forensic monologue in John 5:19-47; the Midrashic homily (with expansions and interruptions, notably 6:41-42) in 6:26-58; and the farewell discourse(s) (13:31-17:26 with several interruptions that will draw our attention below, including 14:8 and 16:17-18).

⁵ On the importance of Jesus' words as a witness to him in the structure of the Fourth Gospel, see Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 2:256-64, which builds on arguments from two previous articles, "The Witnesses to Jesus in John 5:31-40 and Belief in the Fourth Gospel," *CBQ* 43/3 (1981): 385-404 and "Literary Structure and Theological Argument in Three Discourses with the Jews in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 103/4 (1984): 575-84.

⁶ In fact Jesus has not said φιλεῖς με three times since the first two times he asked, ἀγαπᾷς με; However, Peter replies in each case with φιλῶ σε and Jesus picks up his verb in the third case. The change in wording does not prevent the narrator from labeling 21:17 as the third time that Jesus asked, "Do you love me?"

Indeed John is highly self-referential, with frequent conscious reflections on what Jesus and other characters have already said or done. Often this is accomplished through the narrator, as in the example just given. Two famous reflections on what Jesus has done are the numbering of two of the signs in Galilee (2:11; 4:54). At other times the narrator reflects on what Jesus has said, interpreting his words for the audience. One of these so-called Johannine parentheses applies seemingly unrelated words of Jesus to his passion: Jesus' prediction about the destruction and rebuilding of the temple (2:19) is reinterpreted as a prediction about his own death and resurrection (2:21): "but he was speaking concerning the sanctuary of his body."⁷ The phrase itself is left to stand while the narrator provides an authoritative interpretation. Another case occurs after Jesus predicts that he will be lifted up from the earth (12:32), and the narrator jumps in to explain (12:33; cf. 21:19): "but he said *this* (τοῦτο) signifying what kind of death he was about to die." Jesus himself occasionally explains the purpose of his speech, as he does after claiming the role of the true vine and elaborating what it means to remain in him (15:11): "I have said these things (ταῦτα) to you so that my joy might remain in you."

These three characteristics of the Fourth Gospel (its tendency to be both self-referential and repetitious as well as the importance of speech, especially by Jesus) come together in a device that I will label *direct internal quotation* (or DIQ): the direct quotation of a character's speech act that has previously occurred in the story world, whether by the same character, another character, or by the narrator. Since the majority of

⁷ On the Johannine parentheses, see Gilbert van Belle, *Les parenthèses dans l'évangile de Jean: Aperçu historique et classification. Texte grec de Jean* (SNTA 11; Leuven: Leuven University, 1985) and "L'accomplissement de la parole de Jésus: La parenthèse de Jn 18,9," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL 131; ed. C.M. Tuckett; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987), 515-21.

the dialogue belongs to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, he is frequently the character who is re-quoted. In doing so, focus is placed on Jesus' *word* in a *self-referential* and often *repetitious* manner. One example where Jesus quotes himself happens during his last meal and in the farewell discourse that follows:

John 13:16: "Amen, amen I say to you, a slave is not greater than his master..."

John 15:20: "Remember the word that I told you, 'A slave is not greater than his master'."

First we might notice that the characteristically Johannine introduction, "Amen, amen *I say to you*," underlines the words of Jesus as speech acts with authority and gravity.⁸ At the second occurrence, though, Jesus does not merely restate the aphorism given earlier in the meal: he specifically draws attention to a previous speech act, i.e. to the fact that he has already said it, before expanding on its message.

At other times Jesus does simply repeat what he has already said, as he does in 7:34 and 8:21 (note the use of "he said again" [εἶπεν πάλιν] in the latter verse), yet in each of these two cases other characters immediately quote him in a way that exposes their failure to understand:

John 7:34 (Jesus): "You will seek me and you will not find [me]; and where I am you cannot come."

John 7:36 (the Jews): "What is this word that he said, 'You will seek me and you will not find [me]; and where I am you cannot come'?"⁹

⁸ Similar constructions appear in the Synoptic Gospels, either with a single amen or with a Greek equivalent (e.g. Luke 9:27, λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς), although John has nearly twice as many such sayings as the nearest Synoptic text (25 cases in John, 13 cases in Mark). However the *double* amen is unique to John.

⁹ Adolph Schlatter (*Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt: Ein Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium* [2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1948], 199) argues that the question asked by the Jews, "What is this word he said...?" is a rabbinic form. The only close example he gives, *Av. R. Nathan* 67, however, is much later than John (8th century), even if asked by disciples of Johanan ben Zakkai.

The Jews in Jerusalem here not only repeat what Jesus has just said, they find a reasonable if incorrect interpretation of his words (that he will go and teach among the Greeks, 7:35). When Jesus repeats this statement in a slightly modified form, they will again misunderstand him (this time that he will kill himself) while quoting him exactly:

John 8:21 (Jesus): “I am going and you will seek me, and you will die in your sin; where I am going you cannot come.”

John 8:22 (the Jews): “He is not going to kill himself, is he? Because he says, ‘Where I am going you cannot come’?”

Jesus will later invert this pattern with the same phrase when he first *quotes* what he said to the Jews (13:33, citing 8:21 exactly) before *repeating* it a third time (13:36):¹⁰

John 13:33: “Children, I am with you still a little while. You will seek me, and just as I said to the Jews, ‘Where I am going you cannot come’.”

John 13:36: “Where I am going you cannot follow me now, but you will follow later.”

In a certain sense, every speech act in the gospel is the quotation of a character by the narrator.¹¹ Even if this is so, there are cases where the narrator reports a single speech act directly multiple times, as happens when Jesus is arrested:

John 18:5: He [Jesus] said to them, “I am.”

¹⁰ Note also that Jesus *repeats* the question, “Do you love (ἀγαπᾷς/φιλεῖς) me?” three times as three separate speech acts reported by the narrator (21:15-17), but the narrator *re-quotes* him only once while noting that it is the third time that he said it (21:17).

¹¹ This has led Savran (*Telling and Retelling*, 20) to eliminate re-quotations by the narrator from his examination of this device in the historical books of the Hebrew Bible (see below). I have included them because in either case a single speech act is reported multiple times; that both instances are reported by the narrator (i.e. in the narrative) makes these cases similar to those where a character quotes himself, in which case the character acts as another (sub-)narrator within the story. See also Savran’s “The Character as Narrator in Biblical Narrative,” *ProofTexts* 5/1 (Special Issue on Storytelling, 1985): 1-17. However, Savran’s point that the narrator’s second recitation only functions at the level of the narrative (or in his terms, the discourse) and not at the level of the story is well taken (i.e. the audience can examine and compare both quotations of the statement but none of the characters can).

John 18:6: Then when he said to them, “I am,” they drew back and fell to the ground.

The Johannine parentheses demonstrate that it is possible for the narrator to comment on a speech act without re-quoting it in direct speech; in this case, we would expect something like, “When he said *this*, they drew back.” Another option would be to quote Jesus indirectly, but to do so here would distract from the importance of Jesus’ particular choice of words. Although his statement in 18:5 can be read as Jesus simply declaring, “I am he” or “It is I,” the DIQ highlights the fact that Jesus has invoked the divine ἐγώ εἰμι in a way that “He told them that *he is* (ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν)...” does not.¹²

However, the three examples above are among the relatively few cases where the previous speech act is quoted exactly, barring abridgments. As in the third case, truly exact quotations are often quite short (see also 4:10/4:7). Instead, the statements of characters are frequently modified when re-quoted, whether they are quoting themselves, being quoted by others, or being quoted by the narrator. Sometimes the changes are quite small: in 8:21, for example, Jesus tells the unbelieving Jews that they will die in their *sin* (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ); in 8:24, he claims that he told them that they will die in their *sins* (ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις). The grammatical structure of this second claim, as well as the combination of persons involved, allows us to read it as an indirect quote,¹³ but that is not the case later in the chapter when the Jews comment on something Jesus has just said:

John 8:51: “Amen, amen, I say to you, if anyone keeps my word, he will never see death.”

¹² For a thorough examination of John’s use of “I am,” see David M. Ball, *‘I Am’ in John’s Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications* (JSNTSup 124; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996).

¹³ As it is rendered in the NA²⁸, SBLGNT, and UBS critical editions, as well as the NASB, NET, NIV, NKJV, and NRSV. On distinguishing direct from indirect quotations in the Greek text, see the Appendix.

John 8:52: [So] the Jews said to him, “Now we know that you have a demon. Abraham and the prophets died, and you say, ‘If anyone keeps my word, he will never taste death’!”

Here there are grammatical changes that accompany changes in word order which will be examined below, but more importantly the Jews alter the verb from *seeing* death to *tasting* it. They have gotten the gist of what he says, yet they have misunderstood Jesus to be saying that keeping his words will ward off physical death. That they also modify his wording has led some Johannine scholars to conclude that there is a connection between misunderstanding and misquotation, as Jerome Neyrey does when he comments: “The crowd’s error concerning Jesus’ words is courtroom evidence that they do not ‘keep my words’.”¹⁴

How the Jews modify Jesus’ statement is potentially significant. *That* they do may not be. This can be demonstrated negatively and positively. Within the same scene the Jews have misunderstood Jesus on multiple occasions, several of which involved DIQ. Two of the more noted examples occur when Jesus tells the Jews that where he is (going) they cannot come (7:36/7:34 and 8:22/8:21 [quoted above]), yet in neither case do they alter his wording, so far as they quote him. The misunderstanding does not arise from *keeping the wrong words* but from *providing the wrong interpretation*.¹⁵ In the latter case, however, Jesus ‘misquotes’ himself soon after (see above on 8:24). While inter-

¹⁴ Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Gospel of John* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 166.

¹⁵ In light of the previous example, it is tempting to think of *Gospel of Thomas* 1: Whoever finds the interpretation of these words will not taste death ([θανάτου] οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται in *P. Oxy.* 654).

preters have found significance in Jesus' change from "sin" to "sins,"¹⁶ they have not concluded that Jesus *misunderstands* himself or that he changes the wording in error. Therefore inexact quotations are neither necessary nor sufficient to signify error and misunderstanding. One might think that this would caution Johannine scholars from putting too much weight on the mere fact of misquotation, but as we will soon see, the inexactness of John's direct internal quotations has drawn a great deal of attention.

This lack of exactness in cases of verifiable DIQ leads to some difficulty in several cases where a character is seemingly re-quoted as saying something that has never been reported in the narrative.¹⁷ As an example, in one case the narrator cites something Jesus has said in formulaic language generally reserved for scriptural citations:

John 18:9: ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν, ὅτι οὓς δέδωκάς μοι, οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα.

...in order that the word which he spoke might be fulfilled, "I did not lose one of those whom you have given me."

The only problem is that Jesus has never used these exact words. Three verses have frequently been suggested as possible antecedents for this quotation:

John 6:39: "This is the will of the one who sent me, that *I should not lose of everything that he has given me* (πάν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ), but I should raise it on the last day."

¹⁶ For example, Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (BNTC IV; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 268: "The shift in terminology to the plural 'sins' (cf. v. 21) may be no more than stylistic but also indicates that the primary sin of unbelief is exhibited in a variety of actions."

¹⁷ For the sake of clarification, it might be best to distinguish narrative from story at this point: "The 'narrative' is the text (the signifier, the discourse, or the 'how') which conveys the 'story' (the signified, the content, or the 'what')" (R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983], 53). In the case of trustworthy characters like Jesus (14:2) or the narrator (18:9), we are confident that something like this has been previously said *in the story world* even if the speech act to which they refer has not appeared *in the narrative*. In the case of untrustworthy characters such as the chief priests (19:21), we may not.

John 10:28: “And I give (δίδωμι) eternal life to them, and *they will not perish* (οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται) forever...”

John 17:12: “When I was with them I kept them in your name, which *you have given me* (ὃ δέδωκάς μοι), and I guarded [them], and *not one of them was lost* (οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο) except the son of perdition, so that Scripture may be fulfilled.”

The first possibility is structurally the closest (even if shifted into the neuter and the third person), while the last case is the most frequently cited antecedent for 18:9 (e.g. see Table 1). Yet at no point does Jesus say precisely what he is quoted as saying—a word that the narrator nonetheless seems to imply must be fulfilled.

Several other cases present similar difficulties, where the quoted phrase is either heavily paraphrased or entirely absent. Sometimes it is easier for scholars to accept that the line was spoken outside of the narrative, as is the case with John the Baptist’s citation of something God has told him (1:33):

John 1:33: “I also did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize in water told me, ‘The one on whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, this one is the one who baptizes in Holy Spirit’.”

Since John appears in the narrative so briefly, a narrative that the audience enters after the events assumed by John, scholars tend to accept that John was told this at *some* earlier point that the author has chosen not to narrate.¹⁸ In other cases, phrases that are ‘close enough’ or which match in sense but not in wording are sought out, as perhaps is the case with Jesus’ fulfilled word in John 18:9. Both scribes and translators have struggled with the unverifiable quotation in John 14:2, sometimes doing their utmost to eliminate a self-

¹⁸ In a fashion similar to his rhetorical question on 6:36 (see above), Euthymius asks when God told John that the one on whom he sees the Spirit descending and remaining is the one who baptizes in the Holy Spirit. He concludes simply that it must have been as the baptism approached, so that what was revealed to him would soon be demonstrated (PG 129:548 col. 1136). The scene’s absence in the narrative does not seem to bother him.

quotation by Jesus that seemingly has no antecedent.¹⁹ The possibility remains that Jesus quotes something that the gospel has simply failed to report. In this case, the quotation becomes a sort of completing analepsis, a ‘flashback’ to an event that has not been narrated.²⁰ These *completing* or *unverifiable quotations* can still be considered direct internal quotations, although in this case they are internal to the *story* but not to the *narrative*. Such a phenomenon is not unheard of in the Synoptic Gospels (e.g. Matt 11:18-19 // Luke 7:33-34) and Acts (e.g. 27:24), and quite common in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. 1 Kings 22:20-22; also see below).²¹ Going forward, recognition of John’s tendency to vary quotations (so that a statement may be dramatically altered in recitation) will be maintained alongside the possibility that the narrator only reports the quotation but not the original statement.

¹⁹ More detail will be given below on John 14:2 in the Appendix, but in the ancient manuscripts there seems to be confusion over the presence of both the $\alpha\upsilon$ and the $\delta\tau\iota$ that mark the quotation (e.g. for the $\delta\tau\iota$, P⁶⁶ is corrected to include it while C is corrected to eliminate it).

²⁰ Jerome T. Walsh (*Old Testament Narrative: A Guide to Interpretation* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009], 58) refers to analepsis simply as “flashback” and prolepsis as “foreshadowing.” Although rare, it is possible for DIQ to be proleptic (cf. 1:15/1:30/1:27). The message that Jesus gives to Mary Magdalene in 20:17 to give to the disciples can be viewed as a completing prolepsis, where the recitation takes place outside of the narrative (cf. 20:18). Although messages are a common source of DIQ in the OT, they are absent in John.

²¹ Matt 11:18-19 reads: “For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, ‘He has a demon’; the Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, ‘Look, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!’” The imputed statements are quite similar in Luke 7:33-34, varying only in word order. In Acts 27:24, Paul claims that an angel came to him the previous night and said, “Do not be afraid, Paul; you must stand before the emperor; and indeed, God has granted safety to all those who are sailing with you.” The narrator presents no such speech act outside of Paul’s quotation; see additionally Acts 6:14; 20:35; 22:14-16, 18-21; 26:16-18. In 1 Kings 22:20-22, the prophet Micaiah condemns the prophets who encourage Jehoshaphat by narrating a dialogue between Yhwh and a lying spirit who takes responsibility for their prophecies. When exactly Micaiah witnessed this scene, as he claims to have (1 Kings 22:19), is unclear since it has not been narrated until Micaiah presents the story here.

The commentaries have occasionally noted John's tendency to re-quote material, or have struggled to find precedents for paraphrased quotations.²² However, this often amounts to little more than a parenthetical remark. Instead it is studies on the style of the Fourth Gospel that analyze the device systematically. However, many of these studies are simply catalogues of verses that involve DIQ embedded in discussions of authorial unity, repetition and variation, or the Fourth Gospel's (lack of) historicity. Nonetheless, a growing appreciation of the function and complexity of this device in John is apparent in these discussions.

Previous Works on DIQ in the Gospel of John and Other Biblical Texts

An early example of the tendency to discuss DIQ within the context of Johannine repetition is given by Johann Daniel Schulze (1811), who makes passing reference to several DIQ passages in a section on John's frequent repetition of the same words and ideas.²³ Schulze more thoroughly lists cases of DIQ under the category "recapitulations," viewing them no differently than the narrator's reminder that Nicodemus was the one who came to Jesus at night (7:50; cf. 3:1), which is a similar but not identical device.²⁴

²² In a note on John 6:65, Raymond E. Brown (*The Gospel According to John: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [AB 29-29A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1966], 1:297) remarks that there are places "where Jesus cites his own words quite exactly" (giving 8:24/8:21; 13:33/8:21; 15:20/13:16; and 16:15/16:14 as examples, although later [p. 350] he acknowledges the change from "sin" to "sins" in the first case), while for 6:65 he views it as a composite of 6:37 and 6:44.

²³ Johann D. Schulze, *Der schriftstellerische Charakter und Werth des Johannes* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1811), 63-68 (the section is labeled, "*die häufigen Wiederholungen derselben Worte und Ideen*" in the original).

²⁴ Schulze, *Charakter*, 78-84. See also Erich Stange, *Die Eigenart der johanneischen Produktion: Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der neueren Quellenscheidungshypothesen und zur Charakteristik der johanneischen Psyche* (Dresden, 1915), 17 where he qualifies this same tendency as "umständliche," an assessment reflected in Teofil Bromboszcz, *Die Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* (Katowice, 1927), 83 and Gerhard Hoffmann, *Das Johannesevangelium als Alterswerk: Eine psychologische Untersuchung* (Neutestamentliche Forschungen 4/1; Gütersloh, 1933), 114.

The discussion of DIQ in John by Christian Gottlob Wilke (1843), also in the context of repetition, is even shorter and less complete.²⁵ DIQ appears under three categories: bringing a previous statement up again (9:23; 13:11; 16:15), returning to previous declarations (4:18/4:17; 7:36/7:34; 8:24/8:21; 9:9[*sic*, 9:11]/9:7), and the resumption of spoken words (9:41/9:40).²⁶ None of these categories are exclusive to DIQ and only indicate forms of repetition with which DIQ overlaps. Furthermore, a theory as to why John uses this particular type of repetition has yet to be offered.

In *Das Evangelium Johannis* (1908), Julius Wellhausen makes a seemingly off-hand comment about internal quotations as a possible means of differentiating material by the evangelist from that of an editor: “the proof texts all belong to B [editorial material], as do the curious literary returns, by Jesus, to words which he has already said earlier.”²⁷ Wellhausen does not follow up on this claim, which is only presented to support by analogy the argument that all of John’s *scriptural* citations derive from the editor. Yet it proves to be an important comment since three German works from the next three decades will attempt to use internal citations to support the authorial unity of the Fourth Gospel in response to Wellhausen. Erich Stange’s *Die Eigenart der johanneischen Produktion* (1915) is a direct, psychological rebuttal to source-critical theories of the Gospel of John. Stange attempts to demonstrate that Johannine characteristics appear in

²⁵ Christian G. Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik, ein Seitenstück zur Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (Dresden-Leipzig, 1843), 465.

²⁶ These categories are listed as *Rückziehung auf eine vorhergegangene Angabe*, *Rückgang aufs Vorhergesetzte*, and *Wiederaufnahme der gesprochenen Worte* in the original.

²⁷ Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1908), 106-7 (“die Schriftbeweise gehören sämtlich zu B, desgleichen die merkwürdig literarischen Rückweise Jesu auf Worte, die er früher einmal gesagt hat”). This passage is directly refuted in Stange, *Eigenart*, 42 n. 1.

material that is labelled both original and editorial so that aporias cannot be explained away by theories of redaction. Instead they must be explained by appeal to the psychological character of the author. He focuses on repetitions in John in over two dozen categories, several of which involve DIQ (most pointedly “the cumbersome quotation of the statement by the previous speaker” and “self-quotations”).²⁸ At one point John’s recapitulations are attributed to a tendency toward stagnancy coupled with a fondness for dialogue.²⁹ At other points, they are portrayed as spontaneous eruptions of earlier thoughts brought on not through deliberate (“absichtliche”) associations, but through involuntary (“unwillkürliche”) ones.³⁰ Inaccurate quotations (which match in sense only) are credited to the author’s tendency to cite from memory.³¹ Stange does not clarify why so many of the quotations that are (nearly) consecutive in the text are then quoted inaccurately a moment or two later.³²

Three years later, the dissertation of Teofil Bromboszcz again uses the consistent employment of repetition throughout John to prove its authorial unity.³³ Although he refers to “the repetition of a question or statement in the subsequent response,” the ana-

²⁸ In the original: “die umständliche Rekapitulation der Aussage des Vorredners” and “Selbstzitate.”

²⁹ Stange, *Eigenart*, 28.

³⁰ Stange, *Eigenart*, 41-43.

³¹ Stange, *Eigenart*, 43.

³² There are arguably 21 quotations within two verses of the original statement, including Jesus quoting others (e.g. 4:17), others quoting Jesus (e.g. 8:22/8:21), Jesus quoting himself (e.g. 16:15/16:14), and the narrator re-quoting characters (e.g. 13:11/13:10). Of these only eight are exact (excluding abridgements, which would lower the number further) with half of these of four words or less. Even if the author were quoting from memory with not so much as a glance up to the line before to check what was written, it would be a poor memory indeed to fail so quickly and, in some cases, so dramatically.

³³ Bromboszcz published the dissertation as *Die Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* in 1927.

lysis amounts to little more than a catalogue of repetitions and variations which include this sort of resumption and examples of self-quotation.³⁴

The dissertation of Gerhard Hoffmann, *Das Johannesevangelium als Alterswerk* (1933), builds much more thoroughly and directly on Stange's psychological approach. Where Stange used psychological coherency to argue for authorial unity, however, Hoffmann assumes authorial unity to build a case for his psychological profile of the author as a man in his 80s who is showing signs of his age within the text.³⁵ Sometimes the aging author forgets the narrative situation he has crafted, as when he has Jesus remind the disciples of a statement in John 15:20 as if it has been a long time since he told them, when in fact he has said this barely a half-hour before ("kaum eine halbe Stunde zuvor") in 13:16.³⁶ The author's mind is especially slow ("langsam"), in part because he gets distracted and returns to earlier thoughts on which he dwells but does not develop in a coherent fashion.³⁷ In the case of unverifiable or proleptic quotations (e.g. John 1:15), the author simply does not realize that he has failed to relate this part of the story yet.³⁸ Hoffmann's interpretation of the Fourth Gospel virtually requires that we have before us the verbatim dictation of an old man rambling as he tells a long story with

³⁴ Bromboszcz, *Einheit*, 83-86 ("Die auffallendste und wichtigste Erscheinung im joh. Sprachstil").

³⁵ The question of authorial unity is addressed in Hoffmann, *Alterswerk*, 20-25 where he admits that some editing has probably occurred: post-'publication' editing is evident in the manuscripts (e.g. John 7:53-8:11) but limited by Hoffmann to those cases that have left such evidence; he argues that there is no reason to believe that pre-'publication' editing was not carried out by the author himself and is therefore still relevant for drawing a psychological profile of the evangelist.

³⁶ Hoffmann, *Alterswerk*, 91; although 15:20 could be read this way, it is unclear why it must. No specific temporal marker is present in 15:20.

³⁷ Hoffmann, *Alterswerk*, 114-15; it is in this category that the majority of cases of DIQ are listed.

³⁸ Hoffmann, *Alterswerk*, 134-35.

little structure or development.³⁹ This seems an unlikely scenario for the development of a text in the first century, one which does not harmonize with Hoffmann's own admission that signs of pre-‘publication’ editing exist in it.

Two decades later, Bent Noack returned to the study of DIQ in the context of Johannine style (*Zur johanneischen Tradition* [1954]).⁴⁰ In distinction from the tendency elsewhere to study DIQ as a form of repetition, Noack's interest is in John's fondness for direct speech. However, he makes it clear at the outset that he considers DIQ to derive not from theological intent, but from the direct influence of oral tradition.⁴¹ This leaves Noack's study valuable regarding John's particular grammatical constructions when introducing direct speech, but the analysis is rather superficial when it comes to why John uses DIQ (it can always be credited to oral tradition) or why variations are introduced (a literal rendering is simply not important to John).⁴²

The first in-depth exploration in English of DIQ as a phenomenon occurs in Edwin A. Abbott's *Johannine Grammar* (1906), and like the earlier studies it occurs within a discussion of repetition and variation.⁴³ Abbott makes several important observations regarding DIQ which will be noted below. He also offers hypotheses regarding both the repetition and the variation of statements. Variation is important since

³⁹ On this last point, see Hoffman, *Alterswerk*, 134.

⁴⁰ Noack does not so much argue for authorial unity as he dismisses redaction as a potential source of variation.

⁴¹ Bent Noack, *Zur johanneischen Tradition: Beiträge zur Kritik an der literarischen Analyse des vierten Evangeliums* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1954), 134.

⁴² E.g. Noack, *Tradition*, 143.

⁴³ Abbott likewise assumes single authorship (*Johannine Grammar* [London: A. and C. Black, 1906], ix n. 1), although this is briefly noted and does not factor greatly in his analysis.

Abbott finds only one accurate self-quotation by Jesus (13:33/8:21), although he notes the importance of context in determining meaning: “is it not clear that [the words] are now uttered to the disciples in a meaning made widely different by different circumstances?”⁴⁴ Later, however, Abbott presents a theory that the *number* of repetitions gives us a clue to the significance of a saying. Drawing on discussions of Deut 19:15 (“Only on the evidence of two or three witnesses will a charge be sustained,” cf. John 8:17) in the works of Philo of Alexandria,⁴⁵ Abbott concludes that a twofold repetition points to a rudimentary or terrestrial truth while threefold repetitions tie certain statements to the highest, divine truth.⁴⁶ His numerical theory has not had much influence in the field, however, and in several cases he struggles to shrink fourfold or sixfold repetitions into a lower category in order to fit his hypothesis.⁴⁷

Abbott’s discussion of variations in internal quotations is much more focused on DIQ. He observes some variations in word order that can be explained by a stylistic tendency toward chiasm (as he labels it).⁴⁸ For example, in 4:17 the Samaritan woman

⁴⁴ Abbott, *Grammar*, 402; it is unclear why Abbott does not acknowledge 4:10/4:7 (although he comments on the repeated use of ἄν in 4:10). Two other short quotations of only four words (3:7/3:3; 4:53/4:50) are never discussed whether variant or not, so perhaps it is a matter of the brevity of the quotations.

⁴⁵ Abbott, *Grammar*, 438-39, drawing primarily on *Post.* 28 §96, “A holy matter is approved through three witnesses” (Abbott’s translation), but see also *Congr.* 73, and *Plant.* 3 §§12-15.

⁴⁶ Abbott, *Grammar*, 439 and 446-47.

⁴⁷ For example, the arguably quadruple repetition of the promise that Jesus and/or the Father will do whatever the disciples ask (14:13-14; 16:23-24) is reduced to two pairs of sayings (and thus terrestrial), while the sixfold repetition of “where I am (going) you cannot come/follow” (7:34, 36; 8:21, 22; 13:33, 36) is reduced to a threefold repetition of the entire misunderstanding complex—two for the Jews (and thus terrestrial and rudimentary), three for the disciples (Abbott, *Grammar*, 448-49).

⁴⁸ Abbott, *Grammar*, 407-14, followed by Leon Morris (*Studies in the Fourth Gospel* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969], 307) and Peter S.-C. Chang (*Repetitions and Variations in the Gospel of John* [Ph.D. diss.; University of Strasbourg, 1975], 123) although neither of the later authors cites Abbott. While Abbott

declares οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα (“I do not have a husband”), but when Jesus quotes her back in the same verse he changes her statement to ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω. Abbott does not trace all variations to stylistic concerns, and he offers theoretical remarks on John’s reasons for failing to report quotations accurately a second or third time. One such comment arises almost in passing. Noting the variations between John the Baptist’s statements regarding the coming one (1:15, 30), Abbott concludes by saying, “this is one of many passages in which the writer seems to say, ‘The Baptist and the Lord Jesus said the same things again and again in slightly different ways, and there may be various traditions, all differing and yet all accurate.’”⁴⁹ Due to the strangeness of this instance of DIQ, presented as it is anachronically in different literary contexts (prologue and narrative) with differing introductory formulas (see chapter 3 below), a case *may* be made that the Baptist simply spoke similar words in the story world on more than one occasion. Such an explanation fails in more straightforward cases where a particular speech act is referenced in variant language, although I will take Abbott’s suggestion that the differences could derive from various traditions seriously while examining the tradition-critical dimensions of DIQ.

Abbott addresses the variations more pointedly in the introduction to the section of repetition and variation. Here he calls specific attention to cases where Jesus is re-quoted inaccurately (whether by himself or by the narrator) and interjects:

It is impossible to believe that the evangelist misquoted Jesus or represented Him as misquoting Himself. Our conclusion must therefore be that he wished to

acknowledges the stylistic nature of these changes, he nonetheless warns that even in these cases “some difference of emphasis may be expected.” See further below on word order (chapter 2).

⁴⁹ Abbott, *Grammar*, 427.

compel his readers to perceive that they have not before them Christ's exact words, and that they must think of their spirit rather than of the letter.⁵⁰

Here Abbott begins an English tradition of using DIQ to argue against John's historicity, although his standard of accurate quotation is probably anachronistic, as I will argue below: it is not clear that John's first century audience would have expected a representation of Christ's exact words within a discourse in order to be tipped off by this device that John did not use them or did not have them. Abbott later concludes:

It seems as though the writer wished to bring home to us the truth of Christ's warning, "The spirit it is that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you are [truly] spirit and are [truly] life." The "letter" of words may be described as their "flesh," and the spirit of the words of Christ passes away from us unless we are one with the Person that uttered them, placing ourselves, as far as we can, in His circumstances and receiving from Him His thoughts.⁵¹

Here Abbott has come nearer to John's first century context, where the meaning (or "spirit") of a historical subject's words outweighed the need to record them verbatim. Because Abbott is still focused on the historicity of the gospels (including the words of Jesus), his call for sympathy while analyzing variation in the Fourth Gospel is brief and will go unheeded in the decades following the publication of his still influential *Grammar*.

Instead, the fact of variation itself will draw the attention of English-language scholars concerned over the device's implications about John's historical value. In a brief note, T. Francis Glasson catalogues 15 examples of "inaccurate repetitions" in the Fourth Gospel, echoing Abbott (whom he does not cite) when he concludes with the question:

⁵⁰ Abbott, *Grammar*, 402.

⁵¹ Abbott, *Grammar*, 402-3.

“Could the writer tell us more plainly that he is not concerned with literal exactness but with the essential meaning?”⁵² Edwin D. Freed acknowledges his debt to Abbott up front in an article on “Variations in the Language and Thought of the Fourth Gospel” (1964).⁵³ Freed also acknowledges that he finds the phenomenon troubling when he states his purpose, which is “to show that the variations in John, both in the reported words of Jesus and in those of the writer himself, are more extensive and *present a greater problem* than has heretofore been intimated.”⁵⁴ Freed’s interests in the variations in John are much broader than DIQ alone, but our studies overlap in two sections. The first is the apparent contradiction between John 6:44 (“no one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him”) and 12:32 (“when I am lifted up from the earth, I will draw all men to myself”). Freed finds these two statements impossible to reconcile,⁵⁵ but I would argue instead that it is likely both of these are interpreted through DIQ: the first in John 6:65 (“Because of this I have told you, ‘No one can come to me unless *it is given to him by the Father*’”) and the second through both a parenthetical aside in 12:33 (arguing that Jesus is talking about his death) and through a highly paraphrastic DIQ in 12:34.⁵⁶ This would seem to indicate that the Johannine tradition was struggling to understand how, when, and why people are drawn to God through Christ. Freed is similarly disconcerted by the

⁵² Glasson, “Inaccurate Repetitions,” 112.

⁵³ Freed admits that he assumes authorial unity, but supports his assumption by reasoning that multiple authors could not have produced such a “variegated patchwork,” and the “artistic evolution” of the text could only achieve what we have before us if it was prematurely terminated (“Variations in the Language and Thought of John,” *ZNW* 55 [1964]: 167-97, here 196).

⁵⁴ Freed, “Variations,” 169 (emphasis added).

⁵⁵ Freed, “Variations,” 189-90.

⁵⁶ As can be seen in Table 1, among the scholars who treat DIQ only Wilke and Hoffmann fail to connect John 6:65 to 6:44.

progression of statements regarding Jesus' departure (from 8:21 to 13:33 to 14:3) because they seem to him clearly about a *place* to which Jesus is going and where the disciples may follow. Yet in 14:6 Jesus claims to be the *way*, and not to a place but to the Father. "Our understanding of these passages is no better than that of the disciples."⁵⁷ He concludes with the same despair over historicity that we have seen before: "Could it be that the writer was more concerned with the art of sheer variation than with historical accuracy and theological consistency?"⁵⁸

Soon afterwards, Leon Morris devoted a chapter of his *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (1969) to variation in John as a stylistic feature, including quotations.⁵⁹ However the chapter is short, another catalogue of cases with a brief conclusion more in line with the German school: variation in John is "merely stylistic... no more than the sign of a desire to avoid a monotonous style."⁶⁰ The unpublished dissertation of Peter Shiu-Chi Chang, *Repetitions and Variations in the Gospel of John* (1975), is more typical of English-language scholarship on DIQ. Chang begins with a chapter that compares John's vocabulary with the rest of the New Testament to demonstrate the Fourth Gospel's tendency toward repetition statistically. He follows this with a chapter that situates repetition and variation in John within the context of both Testaments, highlighting many points of

⁵⁷ Freed, "Variations," 190.

⁵⁸ Freed, "Variations," 197.

⁵⁹ Morris argues not only for single authorship, but ascribes authorship directly (if tentatively) to John the son of Zebedee (*Studies*, 292).

⁶⁰ Morris, *Studies*, 318. There is some evidence that Morris is influenced by Abbott in this chapter—he divides the cases into twofold and threefold variations, and he also notes chiasmic variation in word order (including John 4:17)—but Abbott is never cited despite multiple citations in other chapters. In fact, the entire chapter only carries one reference, a criticism of Brown for failing to subject the few internal quotations that he notices to sufficient scrutiny (*Studies*, 304 n. 1); see n. 21 above.

similarity. Yet the sections on “Internal Quotations” present one more (incomplete) catalogue of cases with little analysis and no comparison of the phenomenon with other biblical literature. Although Chang appears to be more comfortable with the negative implications that DIQ has on John’s exact historicity, he nonetheless devotes the bulk of his conclusion to the question, “Does this not show the general spirit in the transmission of the words of Jesus [in John]? Verbal exactness is not of prime importance.”⁶¹ This is quite a valid point, but it raises a second question: if verbal exactness is not of prime importance, what is? The idea that John uses variation to convey meaning has not yet seriously been explored.

Up to this point, English scholarship directly on DIQ in John has focused on the question of historicity. Abbott has acknowledged certain rhetorical and stylistic uses of variation in DIQ, and several others have shown how DIQ fits within other patterns of repetition and variation. Yet despite his ample knowledge of the other gospels,⁶² Abbott fails to compare John’s use of quotations with any other biblical literature, a practice in which he is followed by the others from Glasson to Chang. Nor has a holistic examination of how DIQ functions at the level of either story or discourse been done. We have to look outside of Johannine and in fact New Testament studies for advances of this type.

Beginning in the middle of the 20th century, Hebrew Bible scholars began to look at the impact of quotations on narrative, discourse, and historical-critical questions in a range of biblical texts. Robert Gordis studied the incorporation of quotations from

⁶¹ Chang, *Repetitions and Variations*, 98.

⁶² The *Johannine Grammar* is one of fifteen volumes published on the gospels under the title, *DiatessERICA*.

previous traditions into wisdom literature, especially Ecclesiastes.⁶³ He has noted the tendency to give voice to certain complaints (unshared by the writer) about God's lack of intervention in human affairs through imputed speech (a sort of unverifiable quotation roughly of the form, "For you say..."), a tendency that cuts across wisdom literature (e.g. Job 22:13-20, which begins, "Therefore you say, 'What does God know?'"), prophetic literature (e.g. Mal 3:7-15, where the imputations begin with, "But you say, 'How shall we return?'"), and the psalms (e.g. Pss 10:4, 6, 11, 13; 14:1).⁶⁴ James L. Crenshaw goes a step further, highlighting how the texts pointed out by Gordis sit side by side with other quotations of the *vox populi* that express *over-confidence* in God's protection despite obvious failings (at least to the writer) in the righteousness of the people.⁶⁵ In each case there is the possibility that the speech imputed to others in these texts reflects the actual historical positions of the authors' opponents. Unfortunately all of these cases are unverifiable—only the quotation, presented as an accusation, appears in the text. The audience is unable to compare the quotation with the original statement.

⁶³ See his "Quotations in Wisdom Literature," *JQR* 30/2 (1939): 123-47; and "Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental, and Rabbinic Literature," *HUCA* 22 (1949): 157-219 and Gordis' commentary on Ecclesiastes (*Koheleth: The Man and His World* [New York: Schocken Books, 1968], 95-108). His work helps to establish a precedent for Jesus crediting the use of proverbs and common sayings to others in John (cf. John 4:20, 35, 37; and especially 8:54). However, the cases from wisdom literature differ from John as they are often either *unmarked* as such (e.g. Ecc. 5:2), or they are marked *interrogatively* (e.g. Ecc. 8:4, "Who can say...?"), *negatively* (e.g. Ecc. 4:8, "He never asks..."), although compare John 12:27 and 16:5 ["None of you asks me, 'Where are you going?'"], or *generally* (e.g. Ecc. 4:9, "Men say..."). The lack of precision in detecting these quotations has been criticized by Michael V. Fox, "The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature," *ZAW* 93 (1981): 416-31.

⁶⁴ Robert Gordis, "Psalm 9-10: A Textual and Exegetical Study," *JQR* 48/2 (1957): 104-22, here 113. As an example, this observation occurs while commenting on Ps 10:4, "In the pride of their countenance the wicked say, 'God will not seek it out'; all their thoughts are, 'There is no God'."

⁶⁵ James L. Crenshaw, *Prophetic Conflict* (BZAW 124; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 24-26; due to Crenshaw's focus, the texts expressing this over-confidence are all prophetic (Amos, Micah, and Jeremiah).

Verifiable cases of DIQ are not absent from this discussion either, although in at least one instance failing to observe the phenomenon in a broader literary context has led to a dubious conclusion. William J. Horwitz notes that a sort of *external* quotation occurs in Jer 26:18, where the elders of the people quote something that the prophet Micah said—a saying that can be found verbatim in Mic 3:12. This would seem to set a minor precedent for using unverifiable quotation to incorporate traditional material.⁶⁶ Yet in the same chapter, the people quote an oracle of Jeremiah’s back to him immediately and in-accurately (cf. Jer 26:6, 8). Horwitz concludes:

[S]ince the people’s repetition does not exactly coincide with what Jeremiah has said, one could argue that their response comes before the text of Jeremiah’s speech was written and codified. If their reply were an addition to the text, that response would have been made to conform to the words of the prophet.⁶⁷

Jeremiah’s sample of direct internal quotations is quite small (four cases),⁶⁸ too few to draw a general conclusion like this; as we will soon see, within the larger context of biblical Hebrew literature where quotations are rarely exact, there is little reason to doubt that the same author could have written both the oracle and its variant quotation.

Since the present object of study is a complete historical narrative, the monograph of George W. Savran, *Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative* (1988)

⁶⁶ Micah prophesied a century before Jeremiah, but this does not answer all questions as to the relative dates of these texts. Two points can be made, though: first, Mic 3:12 does not occur in the visionary portion of the book which has the best chance of being a later addition so that it has a good chance of being written prior to Jeremiah, and second, it is possible that Jeremiah is not quoting the present book of Micah but a lost narrative relating a confrontation between the prophet and Hezekiah which the text of Micah may also use (see Delbert R. Hillers, “Micah,” in *ABD* [6 vols.; gen. ed. David N. Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992], 4:807-10).

⁶⁷ William J. Horwitz, “Audience Reaction to Jeremiah,” *CBQ* 32 (1970): 555-64, here 559.

⁶⁸ Horwitz analyzes the cases in Jer 26:8-9; 28:29; 32:3-5 (taken as proleptically referring to 34:2-3); and 43:2-3. All other cases are unverifiable, so that Horwitz cannot compare how accurately they are quoted.

deserves special attention. Savran surveys “quoted direct speech”⁶⁹ in the books ranging from Genesis to 2 Kings and finds 94 verifiable quotations where both the original speech act and the quotation are given, and 37 unverifiable quotations.⁷⁰ That over 28% of the quotations are unverifiable in this large sample marks an increase compared to John, where at most 21% of cases are (see Table 2, where arguably fewer than the 12/57 cases are unverifiable). Another statistic of Savran’s proves important in light of the focus in Johannine scholarship on inexact quotations: only ten of the 94 verifiable quotations are lexically exact, all of them short (two to seven words).⁷¹ Quotations are inexact even when God quotes other characters (e.g. Gen 18:13/18:12 quoting Sarah) or *God’s own words* (e.g. 1 Kings 13:22/13:17).⁷² These ten literal quotations in turn give rise to

⁶⁹ “Quoted direct speech” is Savran’s equivalent term for what I have designated “direct internal quotation.” It may be more precise to say that Savran means ‘direct speech that is quoted directly at some point later in the story’ (see *Telling and Retelling*, 7), although even this designation is inappropriate in cases where God directly quotes a character’s *thoughts*, a problem that does not arise in John.

⁷⁰ Two points should be made here. First, these 131 quotations are given in only 97 speeches (*Telling and Retelling*, 19), which is largely due to the clusters of DIQ in cases where a character re-tells an entire story, as is the case in Genesis 24 (eight cases) and 44 (nine cases). While this happens on several occasions in Acts (as in the Cornelius narrative or Paul’s call), it does not happen in John where the quotations are thematically clustered but whole stories are never retold. Second, Savran omits categories of DIQ from his sample that lower the number of cases: re-quotations by the narrator, citations of the promises to the patriarchs (nine cases), and most importantly the book of Deuteronomy due to the fact that it is effectively one long recapitulation.

⁷¹ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 29; although at just two pages his analysis of the motif is much briefer than Savran’s, see also Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 362: “The form in which an earlier statement is cited is quite frequent within the Old Testament... The citation of a prior statement, although given as direct address, is often in fact a rather loose paraphrase of the actual statement made.” Anticipating a later point, Childs claims that DIQ effectively occurs in two principal contexts: when a statement in the past is used to prove the truth or falsity of a present statement, or when an event in the present is cited to prove the truth or falsity of a statement made in the past. Such a testimonial function is relevant in a juridical setting or as a trial motif is developed outside of a formal trial setting, as it is in the Fourth Gospel (see chapter 3 below)

⁷² See Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 26. In Gen 18:12 Sarah says to herself, “After I have grown old, and my husband is old, shall I have pleasure?” In the following verse God quotes her as saying, “Shall I indeed bear a child, now that I am old?” In 1 Kings 13:17 God commands (through a prophet), “You shall not eat food or drink water there, or return by the way you came”; in 1 Kings 13:22 God is quoted (through another prophet) as saying, “Eat no food, and drink no water.” Both cases are also rendered inexact in the LXX. In

another observation, unnoticed by Savran: even though they are literal in Hebrew, four of the ten are inexact in Greek.⁷³ Yet in other cases, as Savran notes, the Septuagint harmonizes quotations, as it does for example in 2 Sam 11:23-24/11:19-21 where the Greek eliminates the irony in Joab's delivery by making the quote more exact.⁷⁴

Savran's work is particularly useful for narrative-critical analysis. He pays attention not only to whether a statement is altered but how it is altered, what functions the quotation and any changes made in it serve within the story, and what this communicates to the (implied) audience. When used by characters, DIQ can be informative (as in delivering a message), confrontational, self-justifying, and deceptive: "Quotations are not used primarily to tell of the past for its own sake, but to recollect in the service of a present argument."⁷⁵ Although Savran denies that DIQ is a particularly juridicial device in these texts, he recognizes how frequently they are used in cases of prophetic judgments.⁷⁶ Furthermore, many of the examples that he cites are used in self-justification or in bringing charges against others (in a way quite similar to prophetic judgments only without a prophet or God acting as the accuser). Excluding Deuteronomy, the largest

the case of Gen 3:17, God's command is shortened in Hebrew (cf. Gen 2:17) while the LXX not only shortens the command but quotes it indirectly (see also next note). Although I am aware of the problems with referring to the entire Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible as the "Septuagint," for simplicity's sake I will continue to refer to the LXX except where textual traditions actually differ.

⁷³ Gen 44:25-26/43:2-3; 1 Kings 18:11/18:8; 1 Kings 22:18/22:8; and in one case (Gen 38:22/38:21) the quote is not only rephrased, it is made indirect.

⁷⁴ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 133-34 n. 70. Jacob Licht (*Storytelling in the Bible* [Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1978], 61) also notes the discrepancy in this case and warns that it "might be as much the result of some accident of scribal transmission as the genuine product of the original storyteller's intention. Of course we have no choice but to disregard the warning."

⁷⁵ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 21.

⁷⁶ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 23 and 70.

cluster of internal quotations in Savran's sample is after all a defense of Benjamin by Judah against charges of theft (Gen 44:18-34 with nine cases of DIQ). Accusation and defense account for a larger proportion of cases of DIQ than the prophecy and fulfillment motif.⁷⁷ So while a formal trial setting is missing in many of these scenes, trial motifs are not.

Returning to Johannine scholarship, seemingly without the benefit of the Old Testament scholarship just surveyed, Michael Theobald uses DIQ in the search for authentic Jesus-sayings in the Fourth Gospel in the introduction to his *Herrenworte im Johannesevangelium* (2002). This limits Theobald's application of DIQ not only to places where Jesus in particular is quoted (thus eliminating quotations of John the Baptist, the Beloved Disciple, and others from consideration), but also to Jesus-sayings of a more profound nature (thus eliminating brief sayings such as "give me a drink" from consideration as well). Furthermore DIQ is only one of several criteria for detecting authentic sayings, so that just six cases of DIQ are examined in detail, provided they meet these other criteria (3:7/3:3; 13:33/8:21/7:33; 8:33/8:31-32; 8:52/8:51; 15:20/13:16; and 21:23/21:22).

⁷⁷ These two categories could theoretically overlap. In Genesis there are four cases where DIQ is used in accusation, once against Adam regarding the breaking of a commandment (3:17), once against Sarah accusing her of lying (18:13), and twice regarding the potential adultery brought on by the lie (?), "She is my sister" (12:19; 26:9). Meanwhile DIQ is used in defense against charges of theft (31:8-13 [four cases]; 44:18-34 [nine cases]), potential adultery (20:5), lying (20:13), and assault (50:17). With all of this, there are no cases of DIQ to support the motif of prophecy and fulfillment in Genesis, the closest they come being two citations of the promises to Jacob (32:12; 48:4). Even then the former case is a potential accusation against God for promising many offspring to Jacob when Esau is seemingly about to kill him. The discrepancy is still evident in 1-2 Kings where DIQ is occasionally used in service of the prophecy and fulfillment motif (three deaths, 1 Kings 12:9-10; 2 Kings 9:26, 36-37) or in recollections of God's promises to David (1 Kings 8-9, five cases) half as often as it is in defense against (potential) accusations of breaking a vow (1 Kings 2:8), and in accusations of usurping power (1 Kings 1:25), endangerment (1 Kings 18:11, 14), doubting God (1 Kings 20:28), breaking an oath (1 Kings 1:17; 2:42; 2 Kings 6:28-29), disobedience (1 Kings 12:9-10; 20:5; 21:4, 6), and lying (1 Kings 22:18 countered by unverifiable DIQ in 22:19-22; 2 Kings 4:28).

Yet despite the limitations that the focus of his study imposes, Theobald makes several important observations about DIQ, both broadly speaking and when applied to individual cases. These observations serve as a rebuttal to the historiographical concerns that earlier English scholarship had with variation. First Theobald notes that there are variations in Jesus-sayings that are repeated in the Synoptic tradition, drawing specific attention to the passion predictions in Mark (8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34).⁷⁸ Next he remarks that there is just as much variation in quotations from the Scriptures as there is in the internal quotations.⁷⁹ In either case, both the repetition *and* the variation cause reflection on the meaning of the original statement. This reflection can augment the reader's understanding of the saying:

It is remarkable how, in the process of quotational or paraphrasing repetition, a saying at times gives birth to a new saying by itself, as it were. The usually inaccurate quotation is by no means a sign of carelessness in the handling of texts; it is due not only to the joy of variation, but reveals a creative understanding of tradition: the quotation itself has equality with respect to the original wording of the quoted statement and thus testifies to a dynamic of deeper and better understanding which is documented in the new form of the saying.⁸⁰

It is this understanding of the variations that will be adopted as Theobald's observations are expanded upon below.

⁷⁸ Michael Theobald, *Herrenworte im Johannesevangelium* (HBS 34; Freiberg: Herder, 2002), 23; it should be noted however that the Markan passion predictions are variant *repetitions*, i.e. three separate speech acts, not repeated quotations of a single speech act.

⁷⁹ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 41-47. In fact there is more variation in scriptural citations than in DIQ; see chapter 4 below.

⁸⁰ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 41 ("Beachtlich ist, wie im Vollzug zitierender oder paraphrasierender Wiederaufnahme ein Spruch zuweilen einen neuen Spruch gleichsam aus sich heraus gebiert. Die in der Regel ungenaue Zitierweise ist nämlich keineswegs Zeichen der Sorglosigkeit im Umgang mit Texten, verdankt sich auch nicht nur der Freude an Variationen, sondern verrät ein kreatives Verständnis von Überlieferung: Das Zitat selbst besitzt gegenüber dem ursprünglichen Wortlaut des Zitierten Selbststand und bezeugt somit eine Dynamik des Tiefer- und Besser-Verstehens, die sich im Neusagen des Spruches dokumentiert").

Another similarity with scriptural citations regards their function within discourses. Citations of both Scripture and of Jesus' words (marked in various ways, such as internal quotation and the double amen) are noticeable by their role as *Kernworte* or *Programmwort* on which the discourses are built.⁸¹ Of course, these two categories of Jesus-sayings (those marked by recapitulation and by "Amen, amen, I say to you") overlap in several instances (John 3:3; 8:51; 13:16), a fact that influences Theobald's inclusion of these sayings among the authentic sayings of Jesus in John.⁸² Theobald is not the first to develop arguments that double amen sayings are pre-Johannine in part because they serve as key-words to the discourses,⁸³ so that Theobald's application of this criterion to internal quotations (if only in a few cases) is potentially quite important.

Theobald's final general observation derives from the fact that internal quotation is one of several criteria for determining authentic sayings, rather than being limited by it.⁸⁴ Multiple attestation can be an important test for detecting authentic historical material. Although it does not strictly provide additional testimony to a saying in the sense that it is not an *independent* attestation, verifiable DIQ is in some ways analogous if only internally to the Johannine tradition. More importantly, Theobald uses DIQ in tandem with Synoptic parallels and parallels from the church fathers to strengthen his

⁸¹ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 21.

⁸² Two other cases are closely adjoined to double amen sayings: John 1:50/1:48 and 1:51; 16:17-19 and 16:20.

⁸³ See R. Alan Culpepper, "The 'Amen, Amen' Sayings in the Gospel of John," in *Perspectives on John: Method and Interpretation in the Fourth Gospel* (ed. R.B. Sloan and M.C. Parsons; Lewiston: Mellen, 1993), 57-101 and "The Origin of the 'Amen, Amen' Sayings in the Gospel of John," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (ed. R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 253-62; the latter essay is cited by Theobald (esp. *Herrenworte*, 56 n. 155).

⁸⁴ On the following, see mainly Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 56-58 and throughout.

case for authentic Jesus-sayings material in John. Patristic citations can be problematic because independence from John is often difficult to prove, but Synoptic parallels are particularly useful in establishing that some DIQ material pre-dates the Fourth Gospel.⁸⁵ In the tradition-critical section below (chapter 4), I will expand on this methodology with a more comprehensive data set in order to demonstrate that a relatively high number of cases of DIQ can be shown to have parallels—sometimes quite strong—in the Synoptic Gospels and other early, non-Johannine literature. From this we may extrapolate that perhaps some of the other cases of DIQ similarly incorporate material that is traditional to John (perhaps only within Johannine circles) even if it has not left traces out-side of the Johannine literature.

One last study, although brief, establishes more proper grounds for studying how DIQ works within the narrative of John's gospel. Though she builds on Theobald's work, Johanna Brankaer nonetheless alters the criteria by which internal quotations are categorized.⁸⁶ Where Theobald focuses on *Herrenworten* grouped by *who quotes Jesus* (himself, other characters, or the narrator), Brankaer instead groups the quotations into

⁸⁵ Certain scholars would protest the uncritical use of Synoptic material as independent attestation of pre-Johannine material since they would argue instead that the Synoptic Gospels are, at least in some cases, influenced by John or the Johannine tradition. This has been argued especially in the case of the Gospel of Luke, a gospel which admits to using sources and shares certain peculiarities with John (see Mark Matson, "The Influence of John on Luke's Passion: Toward a Theory of Intergospel Dialogue," in *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums: Symposion in Salzburg am 10. März 2000* [Theologische Texte und Studien 9; ed. P.N. Anderson and P.L. Hofrichter; Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002], 183-94 and Barbara Shellard, *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context* [JSNTSup 215; London: Sheffield Academic, 2002]). While it may be possible to argue that John influenced the other texts in one or two cases, the wide spread of this material throughout all three of the Synoptic Gospels argues against their dependence on John in a significant number of cases unless John's influence on the Synoptics was quite a bit greater than has previously been recognized.

⁸⁶ Johanna Brankaer, "Les citations internes dans le quatrième évangile: un miroir déformant?" in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel* (BETL 223; ed. G. Van Belle, M. Labahn, and P. Maritz; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 129-56.

three categories by *how they compare with the original statement*: 1) quotations that alter the meaning of the original statement (“opérant un glissement”), 2) unverifiable quotations (“extra-diégétiques”), and 3) more or less literal quotations.⁸⁷ These new criteria allow Brankaer to broaden the scope of her analysis since she can include quotations of secondary characters and statements by Jesus that are “banales.”⁸⁸

By focusing on how the quotations function within the narrative (instead of behind it), Brankaer makes several important observations. First, she gives a detailed study of unverifiable quotations. Although Brankaer does little to examine these five cases (John 1:33; 6:36; 10:36; 11:40; 14:2) in the context of Johannine scholarship, she allows the possibility that *no* antecedent statement is provided and explores why such a device might be used in John: the four cases in which Jesus is quoted cause the reader to pause for reflection on what Jesus has said and how that might be construed in light of how he quotes himself.⁸⁹ Brankaer also ties unverifiable quotations to the concluding statements in John (20:31; 21:25), both of which acknowledge the incompleteness of John’s narrative: “Quotations without referent in the narration confront the reader with a certain textual opacity: the reader has not been present at all of the signs and works of

⁸⁷ Brankaer connects 13:33 directly to 7:34 instead of 8:21, which is lexically and narratively closer (“Citations internes,” 139-41). Brankaer also keenly observes how the shift in phrasing that occurs between 7:34 (ὅπου εἰμι ἐγώ, focus on present reality) and 8:21 (ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, focus on future reality), exposes the blending of the temporal and atemporal in John’s narrative (p. 140). This is not the only case in which a shift between the present and the future occurs in DIQ, a phenomenon that will be explored in greater depth in chapter 5 below.

⁸⁸ Brankaer, “Citations internes,” 131; note that Brankaer makes no restriction to *direct* internal quotations, which leads her to include indirect quotes in her analysis (e.g. John 18:37).

⁸⁹ Brankaer, “Citations internes,” 143-47.

Jesus.”⁹⁰ That is, unverifiable quotations serve as an ongoing reminder of John’s incompleteness throughout the narrative.

More generally, as opposed to the earlier German scholars who complain that DIQ is cumbersome and slows down the narrative, Brankaer instead argues that the quotations—especially those that shift the meaning of the original statement, often through variations—serve to move the reader’s understanding forward:

The shift made in the resumption is at the service of a progressive understanding on the part of the reader, even if it can be paired with a progressive incomprehension or a stronger rejection at the strictly narrative level. The shifts provoke at certain places a radicalization of Jesus’ teaching which can provoke—or which demands!—a radicalization of the position regarding him.⁹¹

Despite the brevity of her study, Brankaer attends to 27 cases of DIQ in John. Yet this is less than half of the cases, which are given no more context than the gospel itself. A more comprehensive study that builds on Brankaer’s observations is still warranted, particularly one that situates the phenomenon in the Fourth Gospel’s broader, first century literary context.

The Present Plan of Study

Although the focus of Theobald’s and Brankaer’s studies differ, they each demonstrate a move away from being distracted by the mere *fact* of variation in reported

⁹⁰ Brankaer, “Citations internes,” 154 (“Les citations sans référent dans la narration confrontent le lecteur à une certaine opacité du texte: il n’a pas été présent à tous les signes et oeuvres de Jésus”).

⁹¹ Brankaer, “Citations internes,” 154 (“Le glissement opéré dans la reprise se met au service d’une compréhension progressive de la part du lecteur, même si elle peut aller de pair avec une incompréhension progressive ou un refus plus dur au niveau strictement narratif. Les glissements provoquent à certains endroits une radicalisation de l’enseignement de Jésus qui peut provoquer—ou qui exige!—une radicalisation de la prise de position à son égard”); see also p. 133.

speech (and the offense that it causes to a post-Enlightenment sensibility)⁹² toward the analysis of *how* John shifts the wording of statements and what this might tell us. We will first examine how John modifies individual statements through the common Greco-Roman device of paraphrase (chapter 2). With each type of paraphrase, taken from the *Progymnasmata* contemporary to John and so likely to have been taught to the authors of the gospel as part of their basic education, we will compare how the device is used in other biblical texts as well as in Greco-Roman literature before examining how John uses paraphrase to alter statements through quotation. As we will see, John not only follows the progymnastic paradigm when paraphrasing statements, its use of paraphrase is also entirely normal—even somewhat conservative—within its literary contexts. Once we can avoid being distracted by the fact of inexact quotation, we might instead focus on what John is trying to accomplish rhetorically with the device. The Fourth Gospel uses paraphrase to shift the focus and meaning of statements to where the quoting characters (and, perhaps for other reasons, the narrator) wish to put them.

Once we understand how John uses this device in its particulars, we will broaden the scope of our questions to ask how DIQ contributes to the characterization of certain groups within the story—especially the Jews and the disciples—as well as the narrative

⁹² Building on the work of Armin D. Baum (esp. “Hat Lukas Jesus und die Apostel genau zitiert? Die *oratio recta* im lukanischen Werk zwischen antiker Profan- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung,” in *Geschichte Israels* [TVGMS 415; ed. G. Maier; Brockhaus: Wuppertal, 1996], 105–45), Peter W. Ensor highlights the anachronistic thinking involved in expecting a literal dictation of a person’s words when more focus was put on sense and style in the first century; see his *Jesus and His ‘Works’: The Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective* (WUNT 2.85; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) and more recently, “The Johannine Sayings of Jesus and the Question of Authenticity,” in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John* (WUNT 2.19; ed. John Lierman; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 14–33. In the latter (p. 27 n. 53), Ensor notes 15 cases of inaccurate DIQ (citing Morris) in support of the idea that John transmits material that he regards as authentic (in this case, his own Jesus-material) “without regard for strict verbal accuracy” (essentially the same conclusion that has been reached in previous English scholarship, if given a more positive assessment).

itself (chapter 3). This will be done in two steps. First, we will focus on verifiable quotations as a redundant device that communicates additional information about the characters who quote and the content of the quoted statements. Repeated quotation allows John to endorse certain interpretations of Jesus and to eliminate others from consideration. As characters repeatedly quote Jesus while misunderstanding him, the device itself begins to signal misunderstanding when used by characters other than Jesus and the narrator. Second, we will see that DIQ frequently appears in forensic settings, both in the Fourth Gospel and in literature outside of John, whether Greco-Roman or biblical. The well-recognized trial motif running throughout the Fourth Gospel can be shown to be a major motivator for John's frequent use of DIQ as characters testify and have their testimony cross-examined.

After the literary study of DIQ in John, we will turn to questions of a more tradition-critical nature (chapter 4). A survey of the statements that appear in DIQ shows that an inordinately high number of them have parallels to pre-Johannine literature, or at least literature that does not seem to have been directly influenced by the Gospel of John. This observation adds another dimension to John's use of paraphrase: it may be that John not only uses DIQ to shift the interpretation of sayings within the gospel, it may also use DIQ to incorporate traditional sayings into the gospel and to shift their interpretation in a Johannine direction. Furthermore, the use of paraphrastic DIQ follows certain patterns in the cases where non-Johannine material is evident from other texts. Where similar patterns are evident with either unverifiable quotations or with material that has not left strong traces outside of John, we might hypothesize that John is making similar interpretative moves with its traditions even if corroborating evidence is otherwise absent.

The statements to which John applies DIQ fall into several large thematic clusters—most importantly the coming of Jesus into the world, his departure, and his return. Jesus’ departure and return is of particular interest because there are two possible departures and three potential returns that John seems to be negotiating: Jesus’ departure in death and in his ascent to the Father, and Jesus’ return in resurrection, in his spiritual advent within the community of believers, and in his *parousia* on the last day. The final portion of the study (chapter 5) will try to understand how the Johannine group used its gospel to negotiate various traditions about Jesus as they varied from or aligned with those of other Christ-following groups. The study of direct internal quotation in John allows us to watch as a first century Christian group endorses, modifies, or rejects various understandings of Christ’s teachings and person.

Table 1. Direct Internal Quotation in Past Scholarship

| Here | Original Statement | | | | | | | | | | | Re-Quotation |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| | Brankaer (2009) | Theobald (2002) | Chang (1975) | Morris (1969) | Noack (1954) | Glasson (1946) | Hoffmann (1933) | Bromboszcz (1927) | Stange (1915) | Abbott (1906) | Wilke (1843) | Schulze (1811) |
| 1:27 | 1:30 (!) | | | | 1:27, 30 | | | | | 1:30 | | |
| 1:27 | | | 1:15 | 1:15 | | 1:15 | 1:15 | 1:15 (1:27) | 1:15, 27 | | | |
| Unverifiable | Unverifiable | | | | Unverifiable | | | | | | | |
| Unverifiable | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1:48 | 1:48 | | 1:48 | 1:48 | 1:48 | | 1:48 | | | 1:48 | | |
| 3:3 | 3:3, 5 | 3:3 | | 3:3, 5 | | 3:3 | | | | 3:3 | | |
| 1:20; 1:27, 30, 33 | 1:20; 1:15, 27, 30 | | 1:20 | 1:20 | | 1:20, 23 | 1:20 | 1:20 | 1:20ff. | 1:20 | | 1:20, 30 |
| 4:7 | 4:7 | | | | 4:7 | | | 4:7 | 4:7 | | | |
| 4:17a | 4:17a | | 4:17a | 4:17a | 4:17a | | | 4:17a | | 4:17a | | |
| Common | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Common | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4:29 | 4:29 | | 4:29 | | | | | 4:29 | 4:29 | | | 4:29 |
| Unverifiable | | ? | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4:50 | 4:50 | | | | 4:50 | | | 4:50 | | | | |
| 5:8 | 5:8 | | 5:8 | 5:8 | | | | 5:8 | | | | |

Table 1. Direct Internal Quotation in Past Scholarship (cont.)

| Original Statement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Re- Quotation |
|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------|------------------|
| Here | Brankaer (2009) | Theobald (2002) | Chang (1975) | Morris (1969) | Noack (1954) | Glasson (1946) | Hoffmann (1933) | Bromboszcz (1927) | Stange (1915) | Abbott (1906) | Wilke (1843) | Schulze (1811) | | |
| 9:21 | | | 9:21 | 9:21 | | 9:21 | 9:21 | 9:21 | | | | 9:21 | 9:23 | |
| 9:40 | 9:40 | | | | | | | | | | 9:40 | | 9:41 | |
| 10:33 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10:36a | |
| 11:4, 25-26 (?) | 11:4, 25-26 (?) | 11:4, 25-26 | | | 11:25-26 | 11:25-26 | | | 11:25 | Unverifiable | | 11:4 | 11:40 | |
| 11:50 | | | 11:50 | 11:50 | | | | | | | | | 11:51 | |
| 3:14 (?); 12:32 (?) | 12:32 (//3:14; 8:28) | 3:14; 12:23, 32 | 12:32 | 12:32 | 3:14 | 12:32 | | | | | | | 12:34 | |
| 13:10 | 13:10 | 13:10 | 13:10 | 13:10 | 13:10 | 13:10 | | 13:10 | | 13:10 | | | 13:11 | |
| 8:21 | 7:34 (//8:21) | 7:33-34; 8:21 | 8:24 | 8:21 | 7:34 | | 8:21 | 8:21 | 7:34; 8:21 | 8:21 | | 7:34; 8:21 | 13:33 | |
| Unverifiable | 13:33-36 (?) | 13:33, 36 | | | 12:26 | | | | 12:26 | | | | 14:2 | |
| 14:8 | 14:8a | | | | | | | 14:8 | 14:7-8 | | | 14:8 | 14:9 | |
| 14:3-4, 18 | | 14:1-3 | 14:3 | 14:3 | 14:3, 18 | 14:3 | | | 14:3 | 14:4, 18 | | 7:33 | 14:28 | |
| 13:16 | 13:16 | 13:16 | 13:16 | 13:16 | 13:16 | | | 13:16 | 13:16 | | | 13:16 | 15:20 | |
| 16:14b | 16:14b | 16:14b | 16:14 | 16:14 | 16:14 | 16:14 | | | 16:14 | 16:14 | | 16:14 | 16:15b | |
| 16:5, 10, 16 | | 16:16 | 16:16 | 16:16 | 16:16 | 16:16 | | 16:16 | 16:5 (16) | | | | 16:17 | |

Table 1. Direct Internal Quotation in Past Scholarship (cont.)

| Here | Original Statement | | | | | | | | | | | Re- Quotation |
|---------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| | Brankaer (2009) | Theobald (2002) | Chang (1975) | Morris (1969) | Noack (1954) | Glasson (1946) | Hoffmann (1933) | Bromboszcz (1927) | Stange (1915) | Abbott (1906) | Wilke (1843) | Schulze (1811) |
| 16:16 (7:33; 13:33) | | | 16:17 | | 16:16 | | | | 16:17 | | | |
| 16:16 | 16:16 (//16:17) | 16:16 | 16:18 | 16:17 | 16:18 | | 16:16-18 | 16:17 | 16:17 | 16:16 | | 16:16, 17 |
| 18:5 | 18:5b | 18:4 (<i>sic</i>) | | | | | | | | 18:5 | | |
| 18:5 | | 18:5 | | | | | | | | 18:5 | | 18:6 |
| 6:39; 10:28; 17:12 (?) | | 6:39; 10:28-29; 17:12 | 17:12 | 17:12 | 6:39; 17:12 | 17:12 | 17:12 | 6:39; 17:12 | 6:39; 10:28; 17:12 | 17:12 | | 17:12 |
| 11:49 | 11:49 | | | | | | 11:49-50 | 11:50 | | | | 11:50 |
| 18:37 (?) | | 18:37 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21:17a | | | | | | | | 21:17a | | | | |
| 13:25 | | | 13:25 | 13:25 | | 13:25 | 13:23 | 13:23-25 | | | | 13:23-25 |
| 21:22 | 21:22 | 21:22 | | 21:22 | | | | 21:22 | | | | |

Table 2. Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John

| | Original Statement | Re-Quotation |
|-----|---|---|
| 1-2 | 1:20 - And he confessed and did not deny, and he confessed, "I am not the Christ." | 3:28 - "You yourselves testify to me that I said, 'I am not the Christ,' but, 'I am sent ahead of him'." |
| 3 | 1:27 - "the one who comes after me, of whom I am not worthy to loosen the strap of his sandal." | 1:30 - "This is the one about whom I said, 'After me a man comes who has become ahead of me, because he was before me'." |
| 4 | [1:27] | 1:15 - John testifies about him and has cried out saying, "This was whom I said, 'The one who comes after me has become ahead of me, because he was before me'." |
| 5 | [Unverifiable] | 1:33 - "And I did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize in water told me, 'On whomever you see the descending and remaining on him, this is the one who baptizes in Holy Spirit'." |
| 6 | [Unverifiable] | 1:34 - "And I have seen, and I have testified, 'This is the Son of God'." |
| 7 | 1:48 - Jesus answered and said to him, "Before Philip called you, under the fig tree I saw you." | 1:50 - Jesus answered and said to him, "Because I told you, 'I saw you under the fig tree', do you believe?" |
| 8 | 3:3 - Jesus answered and said to him, "Amen, amen I say to you, unless someone is born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." | 3:7 - "Do not be amazed that I told you, 'You must be born from above'." |
| 9 | 4:7 - Jesus said to her, "Give me a drink." | 4:10 - Jesus answered and said to her, "If you knew the gift of God and who it is who says to you, 'Give me a drink', you would have asked him and he would have given you living water." |
| 10 | 4:17a - The woman answered and said, "I do not have a husband." | 4:17b - Jesus said to her, "You said rightly, 'A husband I do not have'." |
| 11 | [Common] | 4:20 - "And you say, 'In Jerusalem is the place where it is necessary to worship'." |

Table 2. Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John (cont.)

| | Original Statement | Re-Quotation |
|-------|--|--|
| 13 | [Common] | 4:35 - "Do you not say, 'There is our months yet and the harvest comes?'" |
| 14 | [Unverifiable] | 4:44 - For Jesus himself testified, "A prophet does not have honor in his own homeland." |
| 15 | 4:50 - Jesus said to him, "Go! Your son lives." | 4:53 - Then the father knew that it was at that hour that Jesus said to him, "Your son lives." |
| 16 | 5:8 - Jesus said to him, "Rise! Carry your bed and walk!" | 5:11 - He answered them, "The one who made me well, he told me, 'Carry your bed and walk!'" |
| 17 | [5:11] | 5:12 - They asked him, "Who is the person who told you, 'Carry and walk!'" |
| 18 | [Unverifiable] | 6:36 - "But I told you, 'You have seen me and yet you do not believe.'" |
| 19-20 | 6:33 - "For the bread of God is that which descends from heaven and gives life to the world." | 6:41 - Then the Jews were grumbling about him because he said, "I am the bread that descends from heaven." |
| | 6:35 - Jesus told them, "I am the bread of life." | 6:42 - And they were saying, "Is this not Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How does he now say, 'From heaven I have descended'?" |
| | 6:38 - "because I have descended out of heaven, not in order to do my own will but the will of the one who sent me." | |
| 21 | 6:44 - "No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him (and I will raise him on the last day)." | 6:65 - And he was saying, "For this reason I have told you, 'No one can come to me unless it is given to him by the Father.'" |
| 22-23 | 7:20 - The crowd answered, "You have a demon! Who is seeking to kill you?" | 8:48 - The Jews answered and said to him, "Do we not rightly say, 'You are a Samaritan and you have a demon?'" |
| 24 | 7:34 - "You will seek me and you will not find [me], and where I am you cannot come." | 7:36 - "What is this word that he said, 'You will seek me and you will not find [me], and where I am you cannot come?'" |

Table 2. Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John (cont.)

| | Original Statement | Re-Quotation |
|-------|---|--|
| 25 | 8:21 - Then he said to them again, "I go and you will seek me, and in your sin you will die. Where I go you cannot come." | 8:22 - Then the Jews were saying, "He is not killing himself, is he? Because he says, 'Where I go you cannot come'?" |
| 26 | [8:21] | 8:24 - "I told you, 'You will die in your sins'." |
| 27 | [8:21] | 13:33 - "Children, yet a little while I am with you. You will seek me and, just as I said to the Jews, 'Where I go you cannot come,' I now also say to you." |
| 28 | 8:31-32 - "If you remain in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will free you." | 8:33 - They answered him, "We are seed of Abraham, and we have never been enslaved to anyone. How do you say, 'You will become free people'?" |
| 29 | 8:51 - "Amen, amen I say to you, if anyone keeps my word, death he will never see into the eon." | 8:52 - "Abraham died and the prophets, and you say, 'If anyone keeps my word, he will never taste death into the eon!'" |
| 30 | [Common; see 8:41] | 8:54 - "It is my Father who glorifies me, whom you say, 'He is our God'." |
| 31 | 9:7 - And he said to him, "Go! Wash in the pool of Siloam!" (Which is interpreted, "the Sent One") | 9:11 - He answered, "The person who is called Jesus made mud and smeared it on my eyes and said to me, 'Go to Siloam and wash!'" |
| 32 | [Unverifiable; cf. 9:21] | 9:19 - And they asked them, saying, "Is this your son, whom you say, 'He was born blind'?" |
| 33 | 9:21 - "How he now sees we don't know, or who opened his eyes we don't know. Ask him! He is of age, he will speak for himself." | 9:23 - For this reason his arents said, "He is of age, ask him." |
| 34 | 9:40 - Those who were with him from the Pharisees heard these things and said to him, " We are not also blind, are we? " | 9:41 - "But now you say, ' We see '; your sin remains." |
| 35-36 | 10:33 - The Jews answered him, "We do not stone you for a good work but for blasphemy , and because you, being a person, make yourself God." | 10:36 - "The one whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, you say, ' You blaspheme ' because I said, ' I am God's Son '." |

Table 2. Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John (cont.)

| | Original Statement | Re-Quotation |
|----|---|---|
| 37 | 11:4 - When he heard, Jesus said, "This sickness is not to death, but for the glory of God so that the Son of God may be glorified through it." 11:25-26 - Jesus said to her, "I am the resurrection and the life. The one who believes in me will live even if he dies, and everyone who lives and believes in me will never die into the eon." | 11:40 - Jesus said to her, "Did I not tell you, 'If you believe, you will see the glory of God?'" |
| 38 | 11:49-50 - One of them, Caiaphas, who was high priest that year, said to them, "You don't know anything! None of you reason that it is better for you that one person should die for the people and the whole nation should not perish! " | 11:51-52 - But he did not say this from himself, but being high priest that year he prophesied, " Jesus was about to die for the nation, and not for the nation alone but so that also the children of God who are scattered may be gathered into one. " |
| 39 | [11:50] | 18:14 - Caiaphas was the one who counselled the Jews, " It is better for one person to die for the people. " |
| 40 | 3:14 - "And just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so also the Son of Man must be lifted up. " 8:28 - So Jesus said, " When you lift up the Son of Man , then you will know that I am." 12:32 - "And I, if I am lifted up from the earth , I will draw all people to myself." | 12:34 - "How do you say, " The Son of Man must be lifted up ?" |
| 41 | 13:10 - Jesus said to him, "The one who has bathed has no need to wash except for the feet, but he is wholly clean; and you are clean, but not all. " | 13:11 - For he knew the one who handed him over. For this reason he said, " Not all of you are clean. " |
| 42 | 13:16 - "Amen, amen I say to you, a slave is not greater than his master , nor one who is sent greater than the one who sent him." | 15:20 - "Remember the word I told you, ' A slave is not greater than his master. '" |
| 43 | 13:25 - The one reclining on Jesus' breast said to him, " Lord, who is it? " | 21:20 - Peter saw the disciple whom Jesus loved following, the one who also reclined at the supper on his breast and said, " Lord, who is the one who hands you over? " |

Table 2. Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John (cont.)

| | Original Statement | Re-Quotation |
|-------|---|---|
| 44 | [Unverifiable] | 14:2 - "In my Father's house there are many dwelling places. Otherwise would I have told you, I go to prepare a place for you ?" |
| 45-46 | 14:3-4 - And if I go and I will prepare a place for you, I am coming again and I will receive you to myself so that where I am, you may also be. And where I go , you know the way." | 14:28 - "You heard what I told you, I go ' and I am coming to you ." |
| 47 | 14:18 - "I will not leave you orphans; I am coming to you ." | |
| 48 | 14:8 - Philip said to him, "Lord, show us the Father and it is enough for us." | 14:9 - "How do you say, 'Show us the Father '?" |
| 49-52 | 16:14 - "He will glorify me because he will receive from what is mine and will announce it to you ." | 16:15 - "All things the Father has are mine. For this reason I said, 'He receives from what is mine and will announce it to you .'" |
| | 16:5 - "But now I go to the one who sent me, and none of you asks me, 'Where are you going?'" | 16:17 - So some of his disciples said to one another, "What is this that he says to us, 'A little while and you do not see me, and again a little while and you will see me '? And, 'Because I go to the Father '?" |
| | 16:10 - "... concerning righteousness, because to the Father I go and you no longer see me ." | 16:18 - Then they were saying, "What is this [that he says], the 'Little while '? We don't know what he's saying." |
| | 16:16 - " A little while and you no longer see me, and again a little while and you will see me ." | 16:19 - Jesus knew what they wanted to ask him, and he said to them, "Are you discussing with one another about this, that I said, 'A little while and you do not see me, and again a little while and you will see me '?" |
| 53 | 18:5 - They replied to him, Jesus the Nazorean. He said to them, " I am ." | 18:6 - Then when he said to them, " I am ," they drew back and fell to the ground. |
| 54 | [18:5] | 18:8 - Jesus replied, "I told you, I am ." |

Table 2. Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John (cont.)

| | Original Statement | Re-Quotation |
|----|---|---|
| 55 | 6:39 - "This is the will of the one who sent me, that everything he has given me, I should not lose from it , but I will raise it on the last day." | 18:9 - So that the word that he said might be fulfilled, " Those whom you have given me, I did not lose one of them. " |
| | 10:28 - "And I give to them eternal life, and they will never perish into the eon. " | |
| | 17:12 - "When I was with them, I kept them in your name which you have given to me , and I guarded them, and not one of them was lost (except the son of perdition)." | |
| 56 | [Unverifiable] | 19:21 - Then the chief priests of the Jews said to Pilate, "Do not write, 'The King of the Jews,' but 'He said, "I am the Jews' King "!" |
| 57 | 21:17a - He said to him a third time, "Simon son of John, do you love me? " | 21:17b - Peter was grieved because he said to him a third time, " Do you love me? " |
| 58 | 21:22 - Jesus said to him, " If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you? You follow me!" | 21:23 - Then this word went out among the brothers, "That disciple will not die." But Jesus did not say, "He does not die," but " If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you? " |

CHAPTER 2

JOHN'S DIRECT INTERNAL QUOTATIONS IN THEIR LITERARY CONTEXTS

Nec aliena tantum transferre, sed etiam nostra pluribus modis tractare proderit, ut ex industria sumamus sententias quasdam easque versemus quam numerosissime, velut eadem cera aliae aliaque formae duci solent.

It will be useful not only to change the work of others, but to modify our own in various ways, deliberately taking up some sentences and turning them in as many ways as possible, just as one shape after another are usually made out of the same piece of wax.

Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory* 10.5.9¹

DIQ in the Context of *Paraphrasis*

The authors of the Fourth Gospel were evidently capable of composing a long narrative filled with wordplay and double entendre in Greek. Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus, for example, is laden with Greek wordplay—some of it possible only in Greek.² The basis for the first case of DIQ in this conversation, “unless someone is born ἄνωθεν...” (John 3:3), is paraphrased by Jesus in 3:7, “you must be born ἄνωθεν.” Nicodemus takes the term ἄνωθεν in an exclusively temporal sense (“again,” see his

¹ Translation adapted from the LCL edition.

² In addition to the use of double entendre with ἄνωθεν, see also the plentiful use of polyvalency in 3:8, which can be read, “The wind (πνεῦμα) blows (πνεῖ) where it wills and you hear its sound (φωνήν)” or “The Spirit breathes where it wills and you hear its voice” depending on how one hears the polyvalent terms. Additionally, Jesus continually plays off of Nicodemus' words: he picks up the ruler's (no one) “is able” and “unless” (ἐὰν μὴ, 3:2) in the initial logion, “*unless* someone is born ἄνωθεν, he *cannot* see the Kingdom of God” (3:3); he picks up Nicodemus' “enter” (εἰσελθεῖν, 3:4) when he paraphrases the logion with “enter the Kingdom” (3:5); and after Nicodemus asks, “How can these things (ταῦτα) be?” Jesus picks up both “these things” and Nicodemus' initial title for Jesus, “teacher,” when he replies with his own question, “You are the *teacher* of Israel and you do not know *these things*?” (3:10). At this point, Nicodemus ceases to speak. Paul D. Duke (*Irony in the Fourth Gospel* [Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985], 45-46) examines these cases of wordplay as a means of creating irony.

substitution of δεύτερον in 3:4), ignoring the spatial dimension (“from above,” cf. John 3:31; 19:11, 23).³ As Raymond Brown points out: “Such a misunderstanding is possible only in Greek; we know of no Hebrew or Aramaic word of similar meaning which would have this spatial and temporal ambiguity.”⁴ As this and other examples of Greek word-play indicate, the people behind the Fourth Gospel were keenly interested in the polyvalency of Greek terms and how to use it to their advantage.⁵ The literacy and compositional ability in Greek that this sort of functional wordplay implies, along with other devices, argues strongly that the authors of John had a significant Greek education.

The Greek education of the authors of John⁶ would have most likely included exercises in paraphrase (παράφρασις),⁷ and as we will see, these exercises included the

³ While past explanations of Jesus’ use of double entendre viewed the two meanings as mutually exclusive—Jesus, operating at a spiritual level, means “from above” but Nicodemus, operating reductionistically, hears “again”—Francis J. Moloney argues that Jesus intends both dimensions of ἀνωθεν, evident in his subsequent paraphrase in 3:5 (“Unless one is born of water [again] and of Spirit [from above]...”), and that Nicodemus errs in reducing the term to only its temporal dimension (*The Gospel of John* [SP 4; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998], 92).

⁴ Brown, *John*, 1:130.

⁵ For more on Johannine double entendre/meaning, see Duke, *Irony*, 144-45, David W. Wead, “The Johannine Double Meaning,” *Restoration Quarterly* 13/2 (1970): 106-20, and Jan van der Watt, “Double Entendre in the Gospel According to John,” in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel* (BETL 184; ed. G. van Belle, J.G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 463-81. Other cases include the Son of Man being lifted up (on the cross)/exalted (using ὑψόω, 3:14-16; 8:28; 12:32-34), living water as both flowing water and the gift of the Spirit (4:10-11), and ἀποθνῆσκει ὑπέρ as both to die *instead of* and to die *for the sake of* (11:50-52; 18:14).

⁶ In what follows, “John” is used as an alternate title of the text of the Fourth Gospel. I refer to “the authors” without any claims about their identity or indeed their number. There are indications, detailed by von Wahlde (*John*), that multiple real authors contributed to the formation of the gospel, not to mention the contributions that were probably made by the social group around them as stories were told and retold. The use of devices such as paraphrase as well as the evident compositional ability of this authorial body indicates that at least some of them had benefitted from a significant (if not truly *high*) education. Indeed, others have argued for the presence of rhetorical devices in the Johannine literature that would only have been taught at a more advanced level than paraphrase (e.g. Duane F. Watson, “Amplification Techniques in 1 John: The Interaction of Rhetorical Style and Invention,” *JSNT* 51 [1993]: 99-123 and Alicia D. Myers, “*Prosopopoetics* and Conflict: Speech and Expectations in John 8,” *Biblica* 92/4 [2011]: 580-96 and

techniques that John uses to re-phrase statements in quotation. In order to establish that John includes techniques commonly taught to beginning students in order to modify statements in quotation, it may be profitable to briefly examine the role of paraphrase exercises in basic Greek education. These exercises are taught early and often, making it quite likely that someone with the literary skill to write a long, coherent narrative in Greek, as the authors of John were, would also have paraphrase in their ‘tool-kit’ as they sought a means of modifying statements while retaining their basic sense.

The fullest and earliest surviving description of paraphrase as an exercise appears in the *Progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon (first century CE),⁸ although subsequently discussions appeared in Suetonius (*Gramm.* 4), Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 1.9.2; 10.5.4-11), and the later *Progymnasmata* (most influentially by the 4th century Aphthonius, *Prog.* 23).⁹

“‘Jesus Said to Them...’: The Adaptation of Juridicial Rhetoric in John 5:19-47,” *JBL* 132/2 [2013]: 415-30). My argument in this chapter will not require that the authors achieved this level of education.

⁷ Those who comment on παράφρασις do so under several terms, including μετάφρασις and even ἀπαγγελία, although in the latter case Aelius Theon (*Prog.* 101) seems to reserve the term for the grammatical modification of an entire chreia rather than an individual sentence; see below nn. 85, 88. In Latin texts paraphrase appears as *metaphrasis* (as it does in Seneca, *Suas.* 1.12) or later, *conversio*; see Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study* (ed. D.E. Orton and R.D. Anderson; Boston: Brill, 1998) §1099.

⁸ Timothy A. Brookins, “Luke’s Use of Mark as παράφρασις: Its Effects on Characterization in the ‘Healing of Blind Bartimaeus’ Pericope (Mark 10.46-52/Luke 18.35-43),” *JSNT* 34/1 (2011): 70-89 (here 72-73) for a discussion. Brookins argues for Luke’s paraphrase of Mark at the level of short narratives (as Theon discusses the paraphrase of whole chreiai, see previous note) while here we will focus on John’s paraphrase of individual sentences. Fortunately, many of the examples that we can glean from the LXX and Greco-Roman literature are paraphrases of this type. Craig S. Keener is the rare commentator on John to briefly connect its paraphrases in DIQ (specifically 8:52 and 13:11) to the paraphrase exercises of Theon (*The Gospel of John* [2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003], 1:765).

⁹ Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 10.5.2-3, *vertere Graeca in Latinum*) and Cicero (*De or.* 1.154-55, *latine redderem*) also discuss nearby the related exercise of exhibiting freedom in translation from Greek into Latin, which may be relevant to those scholars who take John to provide independent translations of scriptural citations. The principles here are quite similar to paraphrasing in one’s own language or even of one’s own work. While in Quintilian translation appears just prior to paraphrase, Suetonius (*Gramm.* 24.4) lists the trans-

Beginning with the *Progymnasmata* ascribed to Hermogenes (2nd century CE), a set number of eight steps is attached to elaborating chreiai: after a brief encomium as a first step, the student is asked to paraphrase the chreia—both its narrative details and the logion itself.¹⁰ Many good cases of paraphrase can be found in the examples of these exercises found in the various *Progymnasmata* and in the school-hand papyri that have survived. However, although paraphrase is evident in the literature well before John (see below on the *Protagoras*), its development as an early educational tool is not yet so advanced and so rigid at the end of the first century.

The elaboration of chreiai, for example, is not as rigid in Theon's earlier discussion (*Prog.* 142-43), but the teacher does give a detailed description of his educational program. The exercise of paraphrase must be mastered before the student is introduced to its use in either elaboration or in contradiction, although the preliminary exercises seem to build up to paraphrase as a final step before applying it to these two ends.¹¹ However, it is not as if once the student has learned paraphrase the exercise is dropped. Theon's program is a successive one: students cycle through various exercises in growing clusters, from *chreia*, *reading*, *listening*, and *paraphrase* to start, and building up to *contesting* and

lation of Greek words just after the inflection of sayings (modifying only the cases from nominative to accusative and so forth) and the paraphrase of short narratives, which indicates that the relationship between the two exercises was close but not rigidly ordered.

¹⁰ This pattern later becomes rigid in the *Progymnasmata* and is followed by Hermogenes, Aphthonius, Nicolaus (5th century), and Priscian (5th-6th centuries). It is not followed by Theon in his discussion of elaboration, so it is unclear whether the pattern existed in the first century. At any rate, Theon introduces paraphrase as an exercise before elaboration and his examples of elaboration feature paraphrases of the chreiai, so that his students would have continued to practice their paraphrase exercises later on in the context of elaboration.

¹¹ See Michel Patillon, ed. and trans., *Aelius Théon: Progymnasmata* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997), xxiv-xxvii for a breakdown of Theon's curriculum.

confirming a narrative, to reading, listening, paraphrasing, elaborating, and contradicting it. What is notable is that paraphrase is an element in each of his thirteen cycles, so that it is practiced not only relatively *early* among the exercises, but *often* thereafter. Although for Theon paraphrase is among the preliminary exercises taught by a rhetor, the student must nonetheless get past the stage of being taught by a grammarian in order to learn it.

Quintilian, meanwhile, is quite adamant that paraphrase be taught by the grammarian (*Inst. Or.* 1.9.1-3), although he admits that paraphrase is difficult even for instructors.¹² However, Quintilian seems to take a “sink or swim” approach to starting pupils on the exercises as early as possible.¹³ Somewhere in between Theon and Quintilian is the discussion of Suetonius (*Gramm.* 4.5), which presents paraphrase as a rhetorical exercise that is sometimes taught by grammarians (which he says was more common in the past), “so that their pupil’s speech would not be altogether unadorned and dry when they were handed over to the teachers of rhetoric.”¹⁴ So it seems that the further back we go, the

¹² Later he asserts that the exercise of paraphrase is valuable precisely by virtue of its difficulty (*Inst. Or.* 10.5.8).

¹³ The application of the phrase “sink or swim” is drawn from Edward N. O’Neil, “Discussion of Preliminary Exercises of Marcus Fabius Quintilianus,” in *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric Volume I: The Progymnasmata* (ed. R.F. Hock and E.N. O’Neil; Texts and Translations 27/Greco-Roman Religion Series 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 113-38, esp. 121-22. Paraphrase is presented in several forms almost as a weeding exercise (from O’Neil’s translation): “They should also learn first to render verses in prose, then to recite them in different words (*mox mutatis verbis interpretari*), then to turn with more confidence to paraphrase (*tum paraphrasi audacius vertere*) in which it is permissible to abridge (*breviare*) or embellish (*exornare*) certain elements, provided the poet’s meaning remains intact. The one who can successfully handle this task, difficult even for accomplished instructors (*etiam consummatis professoribus difficile*), will be capable of learning anything” (*Inst. Or.* 1.9.2-3).

¹⁴ Translation from Robert A. Kaster, ed. and trans., *Suetonius: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). The quoted text of Suetonius reads: *ne scilicet sicci omnino atque aridi pueri rhetoribus traderentur*. Later (*Gramm.* 24.5), Suetonius presents a mix of exercises with no clear

more likely that paraphrase would be taught by the grammarian rather than the rhetor, and if by the rhetor then early on as an exercise in expression rather than in thought. This makes sense since the *progymnasmata* generally “occupied a curricular place between literary and rhetorical study.”¹⁵ Furthermore, although the progymnastic exercises eventually came to be devoted mainly to the training of orators, Theon has a variety of creative professions in mind including writers of history, dialogue, and poetry (*Prog.* 62).¹⁶ In other words, in each of the first or early second century discussions of paraphrase that have survived, the exercise is taught early and often to adolescent students who are either still learning grammar or who have only just gotten past it. Authors capable of writing a long narrative, as those of John were, most likely would have done these exercises as part of their early training.

In Theon’s detailed discussion of paraphrase (*Prog.* 139-42), the educator breaks the device down into four categories which will be important in our examination of

distinction between which should be assigned to the grammarian and which to the rhetor. This may be because, as he explains in the previous section (24.4), the method of instruction varied from teacher to teacher as did the exercises taught by a single teacher: “They would vary the grammatical constructions of notable sayings in all possible ways [see above, n. 9]; recount fables now one way, now another; present narratives sometimes briefly and concisely, sometimes elaborately and at length.”

¹⁵ Ronald F. Hock, “General Introduction to Volume I,” in *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric Volume I: The Progymnasmata* (ed. R.F. Hock and E.N. O’Neil; Texts and Translations 27/Greco-Roman Religion Series 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 3-47, here 21. In this regard, it is notable that several of the school-hand papyri that feature paraphrastic exercises also include simple grammatical exercises, indicating that the student had not yet fully “graduated” to the study of rhetoric (Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* [Cambridge Classical Studies; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998], 203 [n. 54]).

¹⁶ Hock, “General Introduction,” 14.

John:¹⁷ *addition* (πρόσθεσις, *adiectio*; expanding the statement through the addition of words), *subtraction* (ἀφαίρεσις, *detractio*; shortening by eliminating words), *transposition* (μετάθεσις, *transmutatio*; rearranging words within the sentence), and *substitution* (ἀντίθεσις, *immutatio*; using different, often synonymous words or phrases—the most outright paraphrastic type).¹⁸ The paradigm of these four types of change is quite a common one, ranging from entire narratives down to letters in words. As early as the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (1st century BCE), for example, *paronomasia* (or punning) is broken down into four similar types (4.29): by addition (e.g. *temperare/obtemperare*), suppression (e.g. *lenones/leones*), transposition (e.g. *nauo/ uano*), and exchange of letters (e.g. *deligere/diligere*).¹⁹ So Theon's paradigm does not seem to be novel in the first century, nor is it especially rigid in practice once the student is more advanced: he admits that one might mix the various types of para-phrase (*Prog.* 140) or use them together to change the mood of a sentence from declarative to interrogative and so on (*Prog.* 141).

¹⁷ The section of Theon's *Progymnasmata* dedicated to paraphrase has not been preserved in Greek, surviving only in Armenian translation. So for specific points of vocabulary such as the names of the types of paraphrase, we have to turn to other, sometimes partial discussions of the techniques.

¹⁸ See Lausberg, *Handbook* §462 and Françoise Desbordes, "Le schéma 'addition, soustraction, mutation, métathèse' dans les textes anciens," *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 5/1 (1983): 23-30 for the variety of terms that can also be used in Greek and Latin. Due to this variety, it is often context that tells us which modification the author has in mind.

¹⁹ For these and other examples, see Guy Achard, ed. and trans., *Rhétorique à Herennius* (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1989), 165 nn. 161-65. The *Rhetorica* is followed by Cicero (*De or.* 2.256; *Or.* 84), Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 9.3.66, 73), and others; for a survey of ancient modifications following this four-part scheme, see Desbordes, "Le schéma," 23-24.

One may suspect that these are the four most obvious types of modification possible,²⁰ which may be why the categories into which Savran fits the modifications of statements through DIQ in the Hebrew Bible are basically equivalent to these four. In fact Savran examines three types of modifications that are made to statements in recitation: shortening (subtraction), lengthening (addition), and paraphrase. However, for him paraphrase “broadly describes *changes in the actual words used* [substitution], as well as *the rearrangement of syntactic order* [transposition] in the quotation.”²¹ In his concluding discussion of modifications, Savran warns in a way similar to Theon:

These changes are often not exclusive of one another, and in some cases it is difficult to determine where shortening and lengthening leave off and paraphrase

²⁰ They are not the *only* four types of modification possible, or at least we are not required to categorize all modifications under this paradigm. One additional possibility would be the mixture of two or more passages together as Seneca does with Virgil in the example given below (*Suas.* 1.12), presenting elements from *Aen.* 8.691-92 and 10.128 as a paraphrase of a single passage from Homer (see also Maximus of Tyre, *Or.* 41.3 for the blending of *Iliad* 12.327 and 14.80). Since the elements appear in the *Suasoriae* in the same order that they appear in the *Aeneid*, we could argue that a massive omission (of more than a book) has occurred mid-sentence, but it is simpler to perceive a melding of two separate passages. In fact, there is evidence of just this type of extraction exercise in the Egyptian school-hand papyri (see Robert E. Gaebel, “The Greek Word-Lists to Vergil and Cicero,” *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 52/2 [1970]: 284-325, here 318). Arguably John does the same in at least one of his scriptural quotations (John 6:31, “Bread from heaven he gave them to eat” [ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν]), seemingly blending elements of Ps 78(77):24 (“He rained down manna to them to eat and he gave them heavenly bread” [LXX - ἔβρεξεν αὐτοῖς μαννα φαγεῖν καὶ ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς]) and Exod 16:4 (“Behold I rain down to you bread from heaven” [LXX - ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὕω ὑμῖν ἄρτους ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ]); see M.J.J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (Kampen: Pharos, 1996), 50-53. Among John’s DIQ it would be possible to view the quotations in 1:15 (the first clause from 1:27, the second and third from 1:30), 6:42 (blending 6:33 and 6:38), and 16:17 (blending 16:10 and 16:16) under this paradigm. However only 1:15 and 6:42 truly mix elements from two separate speech acts into one, 1:15 in a manner quite similar to Seneca’s; 16:17 can be viewed as double quotations separated by καὶ. Barring 1:15 and 6:42, then, John seems to have employed the four types of paraphrase taught to beginning students.

²¹ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 29 (emphasis added). One might also compare Meir Sternberg’s five forms of repetition and variation: expansion, truncation, change of order, grammatical transformation, and substitution, where the last two are considered here in one category (*The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985], 391-92).

[substitution] begins. Furthermore, many quotations will exhibit two or even all three types of change; one clause may be lengthened or omitted altogether.²²

Such a warning holds for quotations in John as well, where changes in *word order* may be prompted by changes in *word choice* or a given substitution may also shorten the quotation considerably. Although the Septuagint harmonizes quotations on occasion, it more often retains the variance in phrasing from the Hebrew and occasionally introduces its own variance into exact quotes. John demonstrates some familiarity with Jewish Scriptures, at least through the Septuagint and perhaps through the Hebrew texts.²³ Therefore below we will examine the Gospel of John's paraphrases through DIQ in the contexts of both DIQ in the Old Testament and paraphrases from Greco-Roman literature, since each has a fair chance of having influenced the real authors of the Fourth Gospel.

As we trace John's paraphrases through Theon's four-part paradigm, examples from both types of literature (Greco-Roman and Hebrew Bible) will be presented to demonstrate how John not only uses paraphrase in ways that were taught at an early level of Greek education, but also that the literary use of paraphrase in this manner is quite common in the literature that influenced the gospel's authors, whether it derives from Greco-Roman or ancient Jewish culture.²⁴ Observing the ways in which John's use of para-

²² Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 29; by "paraphrase," Savran seems to mean what is called "substitution" in the progymnastic discussions.

²³ See chapter 4 for more on the similarities between John's paraphrases and how it presents OT citations.

²⁴ Indeed, a recent dissertation by Yakir Paz examines the influence of Greek educational *topoi*, including the paraphrase exercise of transposition (ὑπερβατόν), on rabbinic literature (*From Scribes to Scholars: Rabbinic Biblical Exegesis in Light of Homeric Commentaries* [Heb.; Ph.D. diss.; Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2014]), suggesting an overlap of Greco-Roman and Jewish interpretive techniques.

phrase is actually quite typical will allow us to focus on the specific ways that it uses the device to achieve its own literary ends.

Before examining John's use of paraphrase in DIQ, it would be helpful to see examples of what these exercises looked like when applied by students. Teresa Morgan has collected and analyzed examples of paraphrase from school-hand papyri.²⁵ In one notable case, the student paraphrases in prose the first 21 lines of the *Iliad* (cp. Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 1.9.2), embroidering the epic with philosophical vocabulary that emphasizes the precision and logical continuity of the paraphrase.²⁶ The extent of the student's paraphrase is evident in the first sentence:

Iliad 1.1-2²⁷

The wrath sing, goddess, of Peleus' son
Achilles, the accursed wrath which brought
countless sorrows upon the Achaeans...

Μῆνιν αἰεῖδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε...

Bodleian Greek Inscription 3019, 1-6²⁸

I shall begin, Muse, holding fast to this
hypothesis from you: for standing by me
yourself, Mistress, telling of the anger of
Achilles and the disasters which came to
the Greeks as a result of it.

ἄρξομαι ἀπὸ σοῦ, ᾧ Μοῦσα, τοιαύτης
ἐχόμενοξ (*sic*) τῆς ὑποθέσεως· αὐτὴ οὖν
μοι παριστᾷσα, ᾧ δέσποινα, ἐξηγουμένη
τὴν Ἀχιλλεὺς ἀγανάκτησιν καὶ τὰς ἐκ
ταύτης συμβεβηκυίας τοῖς Ἑλλήσι
συμφοράς.

Homer's two lines are greatly expanded, as is the entire passage, and the student has altered the vocabulary almost entirely in order to give his account an air of intellectual

²⁵ Morgan, *Literate Education*, 202-26.

²⁶ "The impressively scientific but thoroughly unhomeric word *hypothesis* is used three times," (Morgan, *Literate Education*, 206-7).

²⁷ Translation from the LCL edition.

²⁸ Text and translation from Morgan, *Literate Education*, 205-6, with discussion on p. 208.

exposition:²⁹ “[the student] has analysed the passage of Homer, decided what to omit and what to reproduce, and in what order, decided how to present the material he has kept using what other disciplines and styles of writing, and he has cast the whole in another dialect.”³⁰ The paraphrase by this anonymous student is significantly more involved than anything done in John, recasting as it does a large section of Homer’s poetic narrative into a different genre. However, we can see from the paraphrase of individual sentences how the student re-phrases Homer into speech of a distinctly different character while still following Homer in his presentation of the narrative (i.e. the student’s first sentence is still a paraphrase of Homer’s first sentence, however differently worded) and remaining recognizably connected to the *Iliad*. Yet aside from the student’s apparent desire to give his paraphrase an air of philosophical sophistication, we know nothing else of the context of the paraphrase or the use to which it was put.³¹

Fortunately an example from Plato’s *Protagoras* is not only confined to the paraphrase of a single sentence, as is often the case in John, but the paraphrase is also developed within the context of an argument over the meaning of the original statement. This allows us to trace Socrates’ reasons for each modification (relatively minor when compared to the student above) on a point by point basis. The passage from the *Protagoras* highlights the precision that Greeks could apply to the interpretation of language, and how apparently insignificant changes could be perceived to exert consi-

²⁹ For example, notice that the student receives a hypothesis from the Muse which she explains (ἐξηγέομαι) to him rather than a song that he is to sing (ᾄδω).

³⁰ Morgan, *Literate Education*, 208.

³¹ Another way to say this might be: we do not know what the student’s assignment was.

derable influence over the understanding of a particular saying. Given the importance of Jesus' words in the Fourth Gospel, it is likely that the gospel's authors would be attracted to a similarly precise interpretation of statements traced to Jesus. After seeing how a master paraphrases a line of text, we will begin to examine how John uses similar techniques with its own text, although in a much less developed manner.

An Example from Plato's *Protagoras*

A masterful *series* of paraphrases occurs in Plato's *Protagoras* (339a-347a) when Socrates playfully imitates literary sophists like his current opponent, Protagoras.³² After getting Socrates to say that a certain poem by Simonides was composed both correctly and well, Protagoras attempts to score a hit against Socrates' judgment by pointing out an apparent contradiction in the poem. Protagoras first cites a line from Simonides: "For a man, indeed, to become good truly is hard (ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν)" (339b).³³ Yet the poet contradicts himself, Protagoras claims, because later he questions the truth of a maxim from Pittacus of Mytilene (7th-6th century BCE) (339d): "[It is] hard to be good" (χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι). In the sections of *Protagoras* that follow, Socrates counters Protagoras with a long argument that the two statements (Simonides' own and his rejection of Pittacus) are not in contradiction and that, in fact,

³² These Platonic examples of paraphrase suggested by Raffaella Cribiore (*Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005], 192); see also Brookins, "Luke's Use of Mark," 73 n. 12. Although DIQ factors little in this dialogue directly (but see 342a, where Socrates quotes Protagoras [cf. 339a]), certainly not in the manner that John uses it, the dialogue is laden with embedded speech: Socrates tells the story of his dialogue with Protagoras as a past event, a dialogue which itself contains an imagined dialogue between Simonides and Pittacus, so that at times Socrates quotes himself quoting Simonides quoting Pittacus.

³³ Translations are generally taken from the LCL edition unless otherwise noted, although I have occasionally modified the punctuation in the Loeb translations to highlight direct quotations.

Simonides wrote his poem as a reproach of Pittacus. Several lines of Simonides and of other poets are paraphrased along the way, but here we will focus on how Socrates progressively alters the statement by Simonides in order to conform it to his interpretation of the poem. This way we can trace the modifications that Socrates makes to the original statement in step with his argument about its meaning.

Before turning to Socrates' paraphrases of Simonides, something should be said about how he uses the interpretation of the poem to criticize his present opponent—in other words, the context of the paraphrases. In Socrates' analysis of the poem, Pittacus retains his status as one of the Seven Sages while Simonides, whom Protagoras himself has earlier named as a fellow sophist (316d), only attempts to take Pittacus down in order to gain fame by proving himself superior (343c).³⁴ Indeed, Patrick Coby traces four points of similarity between Socrates and Pittacus as the former characterizes him, and nine points of similarity between Protagoras and Simonides.³⁵ One of the relevant similarities between Pittacus and Socrates is that both advocate for the laconic brevity of wise speech, with Socrates presenting such *brachylogia* as the mark of ancient philosophy (342a-343b).³⁶ Thus Pittacus speaks wisely in three words while the sophist Simonides

³⁴ As Patrick Coby suggests (*Socrates and the Sophistic Enlightenment: A Commentary on Plato's Protagoras* [Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1987], 99), critiquing earlier poetic sophists may be a regular part of Protagoras' repertoire, so that he tries to place the discussion on firm ground for himself.

³⁵ Coby, *Sophistic Enlightenment*, 110-11.

³⁶ Compare another favorite proverb of Socrates': "good things are difficult" (*χαλεπὰ τὰ καλά*, *Rep.* 435c; 497d; *Cra.* 384b; *Hp. Ma.* 304e). As Socrates presents it here, the Seven Sages were "enthusiasts, lovers and disciples of the Spartan culture" (343a) whose wisdom was characterized by short sayings. Hence, Pittacus contributes a famous short saying of his own: "It is hard to be good."

must employ an entire poem to overcome him, and the ‘sophistic’ criticism of Socrates goes on for much longer in order to improve upon Simonides.³⁷

Suggestively then, Socrates cites the maxim of Pittacus six times after the initial quotation without any modifications.³⁸ Meanwhile under the guise of presenting a proper understanding of Simonides’ poem as an attack on Pittacus, Socrates alters the poet’s statement at *every* subsequent quotation. Actually, the paraphrases begin with Protagoras when he draws attention to the apparent contradiction of making one statement and disagreeing with the other:

First he laid it down himself that it is hard for a man to become good in truth (ὅπέθετο χαλεπὸν εἶναι ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν γενέσθαι ἀλαθείᾳ), and then a little further on in his poem he forgot, and he proceeds to blame Pittacus for saying the same as he did, “it is hard to be good” (χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι). (*Prot.* 339d)

Moving “difficult” (χαλεπὸν) from the end of Simonides’ statement to the beginning (see Table 3) highlights the similarity of the two claims, making difficulty the *topic* of both statements and making it troublesome for Simonides to disagree with Pittacus.³⁹ Not surprisingly, Socrates restores the position of “difficult” to the end of the sentence when he takes over paraphrasing.

³⁷ As Larry Goldberg points out (*A Commentary on Plato’s Protagoras* [American University Studies 5/1; New York: Peter Lang, 1983], 169), Socrates has only just claimed (335c) that he is incapable of long speeches, yet launches a rather long exposition of the poem in response to his sophistic opponent.

³⁸ See *Prot.* 339d; 341c; 343b, d, e; 344e. Three paraphrases of Pittacus are given (341c; 344b-c, e), the second using DIQ, but all ridiculous and in the ‘voice’ of Simonides.

³⁹ On *topic* in terms of word order, see Helma Dik, *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 42-44. Dik defines *topic* as “an element which the speaker regards as an appropriate foundation for constructing a message which is relevant to the subject matter of the discourse” (p. 31), in this case, difficulty. *Topics*, when expressed, are most likely new or contrastive (p. 32). For more on the *focus* and *topic* of clauses, see below on transposition.

In a sense, Protagoras argues that Simonides' maxim is a paraphrase of Pittacus, saying essentially the same thing with different words. That is why it would be a contradiction for Simonides to disapprove of one statement and advocate for the other. Socrates questions this equivalence first by enlisting Prodicus to rule on the question: is *to become* (γενέσθαι) the same as *to be* (εἶναι) (340b)?⁴⁰ Prodicus affirms that *becoming* is not the same as *being*, even if we might suspect that Simonides did not differentiate so precisely.⁴¹ Socrates will maintain the distance between becoming and being throughout his exegesis, a point that Protagoras mistakenly fails to counter.⁴² Since Socrates has established, at least for the sake of argument, that the verbs used by each of the disputants carry inherently different meanings, then the statement of Simonides is *not* a paraphrase of Pittacus—not because the poet uses different words but because those words cannot be made to have the same *sense*. If this is so, then Simonides is free to state one and disagree with the other.

⁴⁰ In this context (340c), Socrates cites the statement again and restores χαλεπόν to the end of the sentence. However, he subtracts μέν here while focusing the argument on the meaning of γενέσθαι, and reintroduces μέν momentarily when the particle itself becomes the center of his attention (343d). Likewise, while commenting on the role that μέν plays Socrates fails to include “truly/in truth” in his citations, although it also reappears as soon as it becomes the topic of discussion.

⁴¹ See Nicholas Denyer, ed., *Protagoras* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 152: “it is entirely fanciful to suggest that Simonides made anything of the distinction between γενέσθαι and ἔμμεναι.” Interestingly, Denyer (p. 151) supports the distinction made by Socrates in part by appeal to John 8:58, “Before Abraham γενέσθαι, I εἰμί.”

⁴² Protagoras fails to defend against Socrates on this point in part because Socrates issues some lines of Hesiod to the effect that it is difficult to attain virtue, but that virtue is easy to possess once one has it. Hesiod and Homer are the other two “sophists” previously named by Protagoras, and Socrates calls both of them to his defense (for Homer, see 340a). Goldberg is not quite correct to say that Protagoras “completely ignores the lines from Hesiod” (*Protagoras*, 162). Protagoras neglects to comment directly on the lines from Hesiod because he dismisses them as leading to a patently false argument, but he still *takes the time to dismiss them* rather than countering Socrates' differentiation of being and becoming—a point with which he did not seem to agree when he originally equated the two aphorisms. The invocation of Hesiod proves to be a useful distraction.

Next Socrates directs his audience's attention to a seemingly trivial matter: the insertion of the particle μέν (343c-d). Using the lines of the now lost poem that are actually quoted in the dialogue as a guide to its overall structure, at least several lines intervene between Simonides' statement and his dismissal of Pittacus. A contrastive δέ probably followed in the missing lines with a subject that is now unrecoverable.⁴³ Yet this does not fit Socrates' argument, and so, in asserting that the entire poem is a response to Pittacus, he argues that the μέν signals the intention to correct the sage's aphorism right from the beginning of the poem:

It is possible in Greek for *men* to conclude rather than initiate an antithesis, and this is the supposition with which Socrates begins his exposition, that *men* is an answering particle. Accordingly, his reading of the poem's first line is, "On the other hand, for a man to become truly good is difficult." But it is patently absurd for a poem to begin this way; and Socrates concedes that it would appear "mad" unless it were posited that Simonides is responding to the as-yet-uncited maxim of Pittacus.⁴⁴

Seemingly having established that Simonides' statement is made to contrast with Pittacus', Socrates paraphrases again, drawing the point of contrast (*becoming* as opposed to *being*) to the front of the sentence (343d): "Pittacus says, 'It is hard to be good,' and the poet controverts this by observing, 'No, but to *become* good, indeed, is hard for a man, Pittacus, truly (οὐκ, ἀλλὰ γενέσθαι μὲν χαλεπὸν ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἐστίν, ὃ Πιττακέ, ὡς ἀληθῶς)'" (emphasis added). Because the crux of his argument rests in the difference

⁴³ In the reconstruction given by Coby (*Sophistic Enlightenment*, 113) and Goldberg (*Protagoras*, 178-80), there are at least five lines intervening (assuming whole stanzas were not omitted). This would seemingly be enough space for Protagoras to suppose that Simonides has forgotten his own statement by the time he gets to Pittacus (339d) (Coby, *Sophistic Enlightenment*, 117). Denyer, meanwhile, takes the position that "every line of the poem was quoted, or at least paraphrased, in the *Protagoras*" (*Protagoras*, 148), implying that Simonides' memory is really quite short since this would put the two statements side by side.

⁴⁴ Coby, *Sophistic Enlightenment*, 115.

between being and becoming, every time that Socrates paraphrases Simonides from now on he will lead with γενέσθαι.

So far Socrates and Protagoras have each been free with Simonides' "truly" (ἀλαθέως), both in form and position. Protagoras begins by changing it to "in truth" (ἀλαθείᾳ) and pushing it to the end of the sentence (339d). Socrates adopts Protagoras' substitution, although he restores its position (340c). The next time he paraphrases Simonides, he ignores truth altogether (343c). Once Socrates can focus on what Simonides means by "truly," it again finds its way to the end of the sentence—not because Socrates needs it there generally, but to segue into his own explanation of its meaning. As he continues directly after his last paraphrase:

Not truly *good*; he does not mention truth in this connection, or imply that some things are truly good, while others are good but not truly so: this would seem silly and unlike Simonides. We must rather take the 'truly' as a *poetical transposition* (ὑπερβατόν ἐν τῷ ᾄσματι).⁴⁵ (emphasis added; *Prot.* 343d-e)

It is not entirely clear that discussing the "good" as distinct from the "truly good" would actually be unlike Simonides. However, in *Theaetetus* (171-79), Socrates argues against (a now dead) Protagoras that a distinction *should* be made between the good and the truly good: "If it is not unlike Simonides to say 'truly good,' the *Theaetetus* suggests that it is unlike Protagoras."⁴⁶ Socrates does not want the point of contrast to be on the good and

⁴⁵ In some later texts (e.g. Trypho, *On Modes* 11; Phoebammonos, *On Rhet. Schem.* 4), ὑπερβατόν is the name given to the paraphrastic device of transposition or *metathesis*. According to Denyer (*Protagoras*, 161), the use of the term ὑπερβατόν for this device in later texts may derive from this passage in the *Protagoras*. For Trypho and Phoebammonos, see Leonhard von Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1856), 3:48,5 and 3:197,20-28.

⁴⁶ Goldberg, *Protagoras*, 115-16.

the truly good, as it seems to be for Simonides,⁴⁷ and in shifting the focus away from this contrast he has good reason to suspect that Protagoras will not argue his point.

Instead, Socrates wants the adverbial noun to modify “difficult” rather than “good,” now applied as an intensifier: “It is truly (i.e. very, thoroughly) *difficult* to become good.”⁴⁸ When he paraphrases again in the context of an imagined dialogue, Socrates isolates both “truly” and “difficult” after the next line of the poem in order to heighten their association:

Let us suppose Pittacus himself to be speaking and Simonides replying, as thus: “People,” he says, “it is hard to be good.” And the poet answers, “Pittacus, what you say is not true, for it is not being but becoming good, indeed—in hands and feet and mind foursquare, fashioned without reproach—that is truly hard (χαλεπὸν ἀλαθέως).” In this way we see a purpose in the insertion of “indeed,” and *that the “truly” is correctly placed at the end.* (emphasis added; *Prot.* 343e-344a)

The transposition of these two elements to the end of the sentence continues in the paraphrase that follows (344b) even if the issue is ultimately dropped for the climactic (and clumsily verbose)⁴⁹ paraphrase that finally blends elements of both statements.

Over the course of the entire exposition, nobody questions that ἐσθλός and ἀγαθός are synonyms, or indeed that ἐσθλός refers to a man. Since it is never the point of dispute, the phrase “a good man” (ἄνδρ’ ἀγαθόν) is frequently displaced from its topic position (at the front of the sentence) and finally eliminated altogether in the last paraphrase.⁵⁰ Here Socrates eliminates the phrase to put Pittacus and Simonides more directly in dialogue

⁴⁷ Denyer, *Protagoras*, 149.

⁴⁸ Denyer, *Protagoras*, 161.

⁴⁹ Compare Denyer, *Protagoras*, 163: “a translation like ‘it is difficult but possible to become, but impossible to be, good’ mirrors this awkwardly interlaced phrasing.” The LCL translation is presented below.

⁵⁰ On *topic*, see above n. 39.

and to contest a later line where the poet claims that misfortune can cause a good man to act badly (344e). In character as Simonides, Socrates continues:

“You say, Pittacus, ‘It is hard to be good’—that is, to become good, indeed, is hard, though possible, but to be good is impossible.”

σὺ δὲ φῆς, ὦ Πιττακέ, χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι: τὸ δ’ ἐστὶ γενέσθαι μὲν χαλεπόν,
δυνατὸν δέ, ἐσθλόν, ἔμμεναι δὲ ἀδύνατον.

Note the possible DIQ. By the end, “to become” has moved firmly to the front of Simonides’ claim in order to contrast with Pittacus’ “to be,” the particle *μὲν* has been retained to reinforce the contrast with Pittacus (which now carries a *δέ*, at least in the introduction to his speech), and Simonides (i.e. Socrates) has imported Pittacus’ term for “good” to highlight that the two are in dialogue—a dialogue that only exists in Socrates’ exegesis!

Over the course of these many paraphrases of a single line, Socrates has used all of the devices listed above. He has used *subtraction* to eliminate elements that might distract from his present rhetorical point: first the particle *μὲν* while he focused on the contrast of the verbs, then “truly/in truth” while focusing on the contrast implied by the particle. He has used *addition*, temporarily inserting the “no, but...” that is necessary to give the proper sense to *μὲν* (343d). Socrates, as well as Protagoras, most thoroughly uses *transposition*, continually moving elements around within the sentence either to emphasize them or to enhance their association with other words (as when he situates “truly” and “difficult” next to each other). There is occasional resistance to some of the modifications that Socrates imposes on the sentence; one suspects that if he were to leap from the original statement to his final, radical paraphrase then his argument would not be

convincing. Instead, he makes each modification in confluence with his argument, building them up until the final paraphrase gives the sense that he needs for his argument.

Table 3. The Paraphrases of Pittacus and Simonides in *Prot.* 339a-347a

| Recitations of Pittacus | Recitations of Simonides |
|---|---|
| 339d: χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι (original statement) | 339b: ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀλαθέως γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν (original statement) |
| 339d: χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι | 339d: χαλεπὸν ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν γενέσθαι ἀλαθείᾳ (Protagoras emphasizing the parallel use of “difficult”) |
| 341c: χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι | 340c: ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἀληθείᾳ γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν (Socrates restoring “difficult” to the end of the sentence) |
| 341c: ἐστὶν κακὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι (Simonides' first paraphrase) | 343c: ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν γενέσθαι χαλεπὸν |
| 341e: κακὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι (Socrates rejects the paraphrase) | 343d: γενέσθαι μὲν χαλεπὸν ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἐστὶν ὡς ἀληθῶς (Socrates emphasizing “to become,” segueing to a discussion of “truly”) |
| 343b: χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι | |
| 343d: χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι | 344a: γενέσθαι μὲν ἐστὶν ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν χερσὶ τε καὶ ποσὶ καὶ νόῳ τετράγωνον, ἄνευ ψόγου τετυγμένον, χαλεπὸν ἀλαθέως (Socrates emphasizing “truly difficult,” not “truly good”) |
| 343e: χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι | |
| 344c: εἶναι ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν ἀδύνατον καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπειον (Simonides' second paraphrase) | 344b: γενέσθαι μὲν ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν χαλεπὸν ἀλαθέως |
| 344e: χαλεπὸν ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι | |
| 344e: ἐσθλὸν ἔμμεναι δὲ ἀδύνατον (Simonides' third paraphrase) | 344e: ἐστὶ γενέσθαι μὲν χαλεπὸν, δυνατόν δέ, ἐσθλόν, ἔμμεναι δὲ ἀδύνατον. |

Paraphrase in the Gospel of John

We do not find any progression of paraphrases so complex or sophisticated (pun intended) in the Fourth Gospel if for no other reason than its authors probably did not

enjoy the same level of education as Plato or Protagoras.⁵¹ Nor do we find any discourses at this level of (pretentious) rhetoric. At the beginning of the section, after all, Protagoras describes skill in discussing verses as the greatest part of *paideia* (338e-339a). What Socrates' analysis of the poem demonstrates is how even minor alterations (the inclusion of a particle, the transposition of words) can be made to reflect the illocution (the intended outcome of the speech act) of the speaker without being perceived to violate the sense of the original statement.⁵² Whatever ulterior motive Socrates has in making his analysis (and however little we might think that he believes his own argument), the ostensible challenge of poetic analysis directs the focus of Socrates to *the wording of a single phrase*, and to the potential meanings that can be teased out of it. For the moment the wording of a statement and its meaning are important to Socrates. As Quintilian will later assure his readers to justify the paraphrase of great works of the past whose wording is already authoritative (*Inst. Or.* 10.5.8): "Does paraphrase not give a more thorough knowledge of the great authors? Because we do not race through the text in a carefree reading; we go over every detail, and are forced to examine it in depth."⁵³

We might reasonably suppose that the words of Jesus, or more broadly the language of the gospel, were at least as important to the authors of the Gospel of John and

⁵¹ However, this does not mean that progressions of paraphrases do not occur in the Fourth Gospel: John 1:27→1:30→1:15 can be viewed as a progression, as can 5:8→5:11→5:12; 16:5, 10, 16→16:17→16:19; and especially 7:34/7:36→8:21/8:22/8:24→13:33, 36. For more on progressions, see chapter 3.

⁵² For an introduction to speech act theory, including locution (roughly, the statement uttered), illocution, and perlocution (the actual outcome of the statement), see Derek Tovey, *Narrative Art and Act in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup 151; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), or more briefly, Eugene Botha, "Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation," *Neotestamentica* 41/2 (2007): 274-94.

⁵³ Modified from the LCL. The Latin reads: *Quid quod auctores maximi sic diligentius cognoscuntur? Non enim scripta lectione secunda transcurrimus, sed tractamus singula et necessario introspicimus.*

their fellow disciples as a line of poetry is to the exegete. At a literary level, paraphrase would be useful in two ways, particularly with those sayings perceived as originating with Jesus. First, it would help clarify the authors' understanding of the sayings. Verbal communications inherently carry with them a degree of ambiguity, a range of meanings, and, as Socrates does here, paraphrase can be used to mitigate that ambiguity.⁵⁴ Especially if there are disagreements on the meaning of a statement, a paraphrase that retains the perceived meaning while lowering the probability of 'hearing' an alternative understanding would help to define what the speaker 'really meant' and resolve the conflict. The construction in John, "for this reason X said" (see 6:65; 13:11; and 16:15), makes John's effort to reduce ambiguity for Jesus' audience, and especially for the gospel's audience, obvious.⁵⁵

Often enough, John uses Jesus' enemies to reduce ambiguity negatively: they paraphrase Jesus in a way that reveals an improper understanding of his word, indicating to the audience how not to interpret Jesus. As one preliminary example (before turning to specific types of paraphrase), in John 8:31-32 Jesus makes a complex claim about himself: "If you remain in my word, then you are *truly* my disciples, and you will know the *truth*, and the *truth* will free you." Jesus focuses on discipleship to himself and more importantly on the truth that will be made available through him. Whatever his meaning,

⁵⁴ The movement of "truly" is an example: its originally medial position exactly between "good" and "difficult" made it unclear as to which was being modified.

⁵⁵ John 9:23 has a similar construction but does not seek so much to reduce ambiguity in the statement made by the parents of the blind man, which is clear enough ("Ask him—he is of age," 9:21), but to explain why they have shifted responsibility back onto their son (they do not want to get tossed out of the synagogue). For more, see chapter 3 below.

it does not seem to be either political or ethno-centric. Yet, if one were so disposed—say if one sought out discipleship to Christ expecting the return of a nationalistic Messiah—one could plausibly interpret “freedom” in political or nationalistic terms. The Jews do this for us, reminding Jesus that they have never been enslaved and wondering how he can say, “You will become free people” (8:33). Only by removing the elements regarding discipleship and Jesus’ word, and more importantly by removing the agent—the *truth* will free them—can they interpret the saying in narrow social or political terms.⁵⁶ Their misunderstanding, exposed in part through an inadequate paraphrase, allows Jesus to clarify that they are not social or political slaves, but slaves to sin (8:34-36).⁵⁷

Second and relatedly, a statement may carry within its range of meanings the potential for contradiction, as Simonides’ statement does. Protagoras is not wrong to suggest that the poet’s statement and Pittacus’ maxim could be understood in very similar ways. Understood as such—and against a less sly opponent than Socrates—he may have easily scored a hit by highlighting the contradiction in Simonides’ poem. What the literary analysis of Socrates accomplishes, including its many paraphrases, is the resolution of this apparent contradiction. A similar phenomenon can occur in John, in one instance through *resistance* to a paraphrase. At the very end of the gospel, Jesus comments to Peter regarding the Beloved Disciple (21:22): “If I want him to remain until I come, what’s that to you? You follow me.” Apparently within the range of interpretations possible for this question was the idea that the Beloved Disciples *would* remain (alive)

⁵⁶ See Brankaer, “Citations internes,” 136.

⁵⁷ Noack (*Tradition*, 146) notes that Jesus paraphrases the paraphrase of the Jews in 8:36: “So if the son frees you, you will indeed be free people (ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε).”

until Jesus came, presumably in his end-time *parousia*, leading to the need for the following clarification:

John 21:23: So this saying went out among the brothers, “That disciple will not die.” But Jesus did not say to him, “He will not die,” but, “If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you?”

Since the protasis of Jesus’ question rests on the assumption that Jesus is in fact capable of empowering the Beloved Disciple to remain alive for as long as Jesus likes, it is possible to understand that *this is exactly what he intends to do* with the Beloved Disciple.⁵⁸ If the Beloved Disciple is dead or dying as many scholars argue, the understanding of the brothers contradicts the present facts.⁵⁹ Just as Socrates rejects that Simonides’ statement is an adequate paraphrase of Pittacus, John’s narrator rejects, “That disciple will not die” as an adequate paraphrase of Jesus’ word. He does so not by paraphrasing Jesus, but by restating the question exactly in order to underline the differences in syntax, including the hypothetical wording of the condition: *if* (ἐάν) I want him to remain.

There is little evidence that the authors of the Fourth Gospel enjoyed a rhetorical education comparable to Plato’s, or that they would have had experience in the high level of sophistic analysis that Socrates engages in (and more so, engages in as a rhetorical ploy). But the authors and the gospel’s original audience would have been keenly interested in understanding the meaning of the text, especially when it represented words of or about Jesus, and especially as competing interpretations or perceived contradictions arose

⁵⁸ In fact, depending on how much of the material in chapter 21 is traditional to the author, it even seems reasonable given the context of the statement: Peter is predicted to die an involuntary death (21:18-19), and he is immediately contrasted with the other disciple who would be forecasted to remain until Jesus’ return.

⁵⁹ So, for example, Moloney, *John*, 561.

from the text. If the authors completed even the beginning stages of the *progymnasmata*, they would have the same tools that Socrates uses so skillfully in the *Protagoras* to guide the interpretation of statements in the text.

However, if John uses paraphrases through DIQ in this way then we would expect the various paraphrases to align with the likely arguments of the speakers in the narrative as they do explicitly so in the *Protagoras*. We will examine John's paraphrases using the four types of paraphrase given in Theon's *Progymnasmata*, and in his order: transposition, addition, subtraction, and substitution. With each type, when we turn to John we will see that the paraphrases not only have the potential to shift the meaning of statements, but also that often enough these shifts are apparently not haphazard or purely stylistic but frequently align with the argumentative positions of the speakers issuing them, including the narrator.

In this type of grammatical and syntactic analysis, there is an unavoidable danger to read too much into what may be only an eloquent variation. This is particularly the case with transposition, given the fluidity of Greek word order, and with substitution, where John, although a very repetitious text, may simply avoid certain repetitions for stylistic reasons. For example, Abbott traces a number of transpositions to stylistic concerns where the quotation places "the *last* word or clause of a saying *first*"⁶⁰:

⁶⁰ Abbott, *Grammar*, 407 (emphasis original).

Table 4. Cases of Inverted Word Order in DIQ

| | Original Statement | Quoted Statement |
|----|---|--|
| a) | 1:48: ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν εἰδόν σε | 1:50: εἰδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς |
| b) | 4:17a: οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα | 4:17b: ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω |
| c) | 6:38: καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ | 6:42: ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα |
| d) | 8:21: ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε | 8:24: ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν |
| e) | 8:51: θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα | 8:52: οὐ μὴ γεύσεται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα |

There are of course changes in vocabulary and syntax associated with the transpositions in most of these quotations, but Abbott's point is well taken. Furthermore, this type of inversion does not happen only in DIQ—it occurs in other cases of simple repetition that closely follow each other.⁶¹ For example, the disputing crowds doubt that the Messiah comes (ὁ χριστὸς ἔρχεται) from Galilee (7:41) since Scripture is supposed to have said that the Messiah comes (ἔρχεται ὁ χριστός) from Bethlehem (7:42). Because this inverted word order is irrelevant to the meaning of the phrase in Greek, Abbott's observation demonstrates that there is probably a stylistic dimension to some of John's modifications of word order. Still Abbott warns: "*Wherever a word is placed out of its usual order, or out of the order in which it previously occurred... some difference of emphasis may be expected.*"⁶² The test will lie in whether the shift in emphasis aligns with the larger argument—of the character and of the gospel—that the quotation is meant to serve. It will always remain possible that a particular word order is chosen for stylistic reasons and the authors simply had no obvious objections to it. However, as we will see there are relatively few cases where word order is changed, so that John would not seem to be a slave

⁶¹ Abbott, *Grammar*, 403-14.

⁶² Abbott, *Grammar*, 408-9 (emphasis original).

to its stylistic impulses. Some are close to one another; some are quite far apart and so also less likely to originate in stylistic ‘tics’. It is notable that a pattern can be found even within these few cases, in which the shifts in emphasis imposed by the transpositions happen to align with the concerns of the characters. In each of the four categories of paraphrase (transposition, addition, subtraction, and substitution), our method will be empirical, allowing that the weight of each individual example may not be terribly great, i.e. that each individual change is not terribly significant, but that the cumulative weight of the evidence will support the case that John uses paraphrase to shift emphasis and indeed meaning through quotations.

Transposition in Greco-Roman and Jewish Contexts

The first category of paraphrase presented by Theon is “according to syntax” (*Prog.* 139), by which he seems to mean changes in word order:⁶³ “when the paraphrase keeps the same words and when we get diverse formulations by a transposition of elements” (*Prog.* 140).⁶⁴ This sort of paraphrase is not undertaken as a first step in the student’s education—first they must learn to memorize written works, gathering together their ideas in the same words, in the same order (*Prog.* 141). However, transposition is a

⁶³ See George A. Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Boston: Brill, 2003), 70-71; Kennedy uses Theon, *Prog.* 130 to support this point, although the discussion there concerns how syntax can contribute to an obscure formulation of laws. One of Theon’s examples there (νέμεσθαι πατέρα καὶ μητέρα ἴσῃν) involves ambiguity arising from whether “father and mother” are the subjects or objects of the verbal infinitive νέμεσθαι (do the children dispense equally to the father and mother, or do the father and mother dispense equally to the children?) depending on whether the verb’s meaning is taken as middle or active (cp. Patillon, *Progymnasmata*, 97 n. 474). In short, the ambiguity does not arise from word order. However another example, given below, does present ambiguity arising from word order, and as we observed with Socrates in the *Protagoras*, transposition can be used to reduce (or to introduce) ambiguity.

⁶⁴ Patillon, *Progymnasmata*, 108; the French translation reads: “On a le mode selon la syntaxe, lorsque la paraphrase garde les même mots et que par une transposition des éléments nous obtenons des formulations diverses, ce qui offre de nombreuses possibilités.”

first step in *modifying* the words of others. Quintilian agrees that the paraphrase exercises rise “from the mere transposition of the words... to a paraphrase in their proper sense” (*Inst. Or.* 1.9.2).⁶⁵ Transposing words within a sentence without changing the grammar or vocabulary is the least intrusive form of paraphrase: the building blocks are all present; one merely has to arrange them in a more solid configuration. Theon does not provide any examples here, but earlier in a discussion of laws he cites one given by our familiar Pittacus that suffers in clarity due to the word order chosen (*Prog.* 130): “The general who is victorious in war should put up a statue of Ares holding a lance in gold (ἄγαλμα χρυσοῦν ἔχον δόρυ).” Because of the medial position of “gold” (χρυσοῦν), it is unclear whether only the lance should be golden or the entire statue. Moving this one word could mitigate the ambiguity; conversely, one might introduce the ambiguity through this choice of word order if one wishes to allow room for interpretation, e.g. to allow for a statue with only the lance made of gold if appropriate.

In addition to clarification, transposition can shift the emphasis of a statement: just at the time that Socrates wants to highlight the difference in verbs between Pittacus and Simonides, “to become” moves to the front of his paraphrase. Similarly, in Gen 42:14-16 Joseph accuses his brothers of being spies and insists that they bring their absent brother to him, ostensibly to test whether their story is true. In the next chapter,

⁶⁵ Translation taken from Charles E. Little, *The Institutio Oratoria of Marcus Fabius Quintilianus* (2 vols.; Nashville: Peabody, 1951), 1:59. Here Quintilian is commenting on the *progymnasmata* generally and the paraphrasing of poetry in particular. The relevant passage reads: *versus primo solve, mox mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere*. Transposition (*transgressio*) is already advocated more than a century earlier in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.44) where an example featuring an unusual word order is provided, but it is not a paraphrase of a previous speech act or text, merely an example of how thinking about word order can help in formulating a sentence.

Jacob asks his sons to return to Egypt for food relief. Judah replies by quoting Joseph (in an abridged fashion):

Gen 43:3: “The man solemnly warned us, ‘*You will not see my face* unless your brother is with you’.”

Judah wants to emphasize that the trip his father proposes is impossible because *Joseph will not see them* unless Benjamin comes along. They go nonetheless, and Joseph frames Benjamin for theft. In his brother’s defense, Judah quotes the scene a second time:

Gen 44:23: “But you told your servants, ‘*Unless your youngest brother returns with you*, you will not see my face again’.”⁶⁶

Now Judah’s rhetorical point is quite the opposite: the earlier threat of not being able to see Joseph again is less relevant since he is currently talking with Joseph. The main point here is that it was Joseph who insisted on Benjamin’s presence, the brothers complied, and now despite the evidence of criminal behavior on Benjamin’s part, Judah and his brothers cannot return to their father without him. In both cases where Judah paraphrases Joseph’s command, the word order serves his argument.

Transposition in the Gospel of John

Similarly, words can be transposed when they are quoted in the Gospel of John. A slight modification that occurs during the farewell discourse reflects the diverse concerns of the speakers. Jesus describes the convicting function of the Paraclete in three areas (i.e.

⁶⁶ There is also a bit of substitution here as well. The quotation in MT Gen 43:3 reads: לֹא־תֵרְאוּ פָנַי בְּלִחִי אֲחִיכֶם אֲתִכֶּם. The quotation in Gen 44:23 reads: אִם־לֹא יֵרֵד אֲחִיכֶם הִקְטַן אֲתִכֶּם לֹא תִסְפֹּן לְרֵאוֹת פָּנַי. The inverted word order is maintained in the Septuagint: LXX Gen 43:3: οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐὰν μὴ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν ὁ νεώτερος μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἦ. LXX Gen 44:23: ἐὰν μὴ καταβῇ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν ὁ νεώτερος μεθ’ ὑμῶν οὐ προσθήσεσθε ἔτι ἰδεῖν τὸ πρόσωπόν μου. Judah adds that Benjamin is their *youngest* (הַקָּטָן, LXX ὁ νεώτερος) brother in 43:3 to defend him against the Pharaoh’s steward, who incidentally was formerly his youngest brother. Note that ὁ νεώτερος appears in LXX Gen 43:3 where הִקְטַן is absent, perhaps an omission by the MT or a bit of back-smoothing by the Septuagint (Sternberg, *Poetics*, 372).

concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment, 16:8) which are then explained using three ὅτι clauses.⁶⁷ For righteousness, Jesus explains, the Paraclete will convict them “because to the Father I go (ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω) and you no longer see me” (16:10). This baffles the disciples, who wonder about what Jesus is telling them, including “because I go to the Father (ὅτι ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, 16:17).”⁶⁸ Each set of speakers foregrounds what is of concern to them. Jesus emphasizes that he goes *to the Father*: if he did not go to the one who sent him, he could not send the Paraclete in the first place (see 16:5-7). Jesus’ destination with the Father is specifically what explains the condemnation concerning righteousness,⁶⁹ and, one would think, should mitigate the sorrow of the disciples. The disciples, meanwhile, have consistently been fixated on the fact that Jesus says that he will *go* (cf. also 13:36-37; 14:5, 18-22; 16:28-33). Although the same words are used by all characters, the inverted word order highlights the point of concern of each.

The narrator’s attempt to clarify what Jesus meant is explicit after Jesus tells Peter (13:10), “You are clean, but not all” (ὁμοῖς καθαροὶ ἐστε, ἀλλ’ οὐχὶ πάντες). Peter has asked to be washed all over (13:8-9), and Jesus has responded that the one who has bathed does not have to wash (except the feet, which they have just done)—such a person is wholly (ὅλος) clean. Jesus’ phrasing emphasizes that his disciples *are in fact clean*,

⁶⁷ The force of the ὅτι in three clauses in 16:9-11 is itself a matter of dispute, but they are taken in a causal sense, explicative sense, or some mix thereof. See D.A. Carson, “The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11,” *JBL* 98/4 (1979): 547-66 for a survey of solutions, as well as the NASB, NKJV, and NRSV for causal translations.

⁶⁸ This translation assumes that ὅτι is part of the quotation and does not simply mark the quotation; see the Appendix.

⁶⁹ So, for example, Rudolf Bultmann (*The Gospel of John* [ed. and trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971], 563-64), Brown (*John*, 2:712), and Lincoln (*John*, 420).

adding “but not all” almost as an afterthought. The narrator then jumps in to clarify what Jesus meant by “not all,” namely Judas Iscariot, and so inverts the wording: “for this reason he said, ‘Not all of you are clean’ (οὐχὶ πάντες καθαροὶ ἐστε)” (13:11). Jesus, reassuring the disciples that they are clean, places the emphasis there. The narrator, who is specifying an exception to “you” for the implied audience, places the emphasis on “not all.”⁷⁰ Again the change in emphasis reflects the diverse concerns of the speakers and their intended audiences.

Elsewhere we might instead focus on the dynamic between the text/implied author and the implied audience. In one of Socrates’ paraphrases above, it was noted that “truly” was placed at the end of the sentence not to convey meaning within the phrase but to segue into Socrates’ argument on the function of “truly” within the sentence: “‘It is difficult to be a good man, truly’—not truly good, but...” When Jesus heals the man born blind, the narrator presents the command (9:7): “Go, wash in the pool of Siloam!” (which is interpreted, ‘One who is Sent’). The gospel takes the time to translate Semitic names and to describe places relatively often.⁷¹ Phrasing the command as it is here allows the narrator to inform the audience first that Siloam is *a pool*, like the

⁷⁰ Cp. Brankaer, “Citations internes,” 151: “Il y a une inversion qui met l’accent sur le fait qu’il y en a un qui fait exception à la pureté de tous.” The intent of the narrator may go beyond emphasis to clarification: since Peter has spent his time arguing with Jesus rather than letting him wash his feet, without 13:11 it might be concluded that Jesus’ “not all” is a reprimand to Peter (stop arguing and let me wash your feet!). Judas appears as an inclusio in 13:2 and 13:11, but he is not integral to the footwashing story itself, which is generally positive. If the story were told without the narrative introduction and conclusion, it would be easy to hear Jesus’ comment as directed at *Peter* under the assumption that Peter’s feet have yet to be washed. The narrator clarifies that Jesus actually meant Judas.

⁷¹ See also John 5:2-3 (the sheep gate, the pool of Bethesda and its porticos); 10:22-23 (the portico of Solomon); 18:28 (the Praetorium); 19:13 (the Lithostrotos, called Gabbatha); 19:17 (the place of the Skull, called Golgotha); 19:41 (the garden near where Jesus was crucified).

Bethesda pool (cf. 5:2). Second, ending the sentence with Siloam transitions into the parenthetical remark that the name should be interpreted as “One who is Sent.” When the man quotes Jesus a few verses later, his phrasing is shorter and rearranged (9:11): “Go to Siloam and wash!”⁷² Without the need to inform the audience of either what Siloam is or what its name means, the phrasing can be simplified and re-arranged to be more direct.

John modifies word order in at least 11 cases; in four of them, only the word order is changed without modifying the words.⁷³ Abbott and his followers trace changes in word order to mainly stylistic concerns while acknowledging that this might result in shifts in emphasis.⁷⁴ In some instances “a change is made for clearness,”⁷⁵ as was the case in Theon and Plato above. Take the case in 4:17 where Jesus immediately repeats a statement made by the Samaritan woman, which contains a transposition that Abbott argues is purely stylistic (see Table 4). The woman’s phrasing (“I don’t have a husband”) underlines what is of concern to her: Jesus has asked her to bring a husband and she *does not have one*. His phrasing (“A husband I don’t have”) emphasizes that the one she does in fact have is not a *husband*, although she does apparently have a man of some

⁷² Incidentally, Siloam is moved from the genitive into the accusative as the object of ὑπαγε εἰς. The syntactic force of εἰς probably slips from “in” to “to” with this modification, as I have translated it.

⁷³ The four with only transposition are 3:28/1:20; 4:17; 12:34/3:14; and 16:17/16:10. Five others involve only minor alterations in addition to transposition (1:50/1:48; 6:42/6:38; 8:24/8:21; 9:23/9:21; 13:11/13:10).

⁷⁴ For Abbott, see *Grammar*, 407-14.

⁷⁵ Abbott, *Grammar*, 408-9.

sort (4:18).⁷⁶ The altered word order allows Jesus to expand on the point of his own concern when demonstrating his special knowledge of her past in the following verse (that she has had five men before this one and the current man is not hers). The re-ordering does not require Jesus to alter the Samaritan's wording, but allows him to shift the emphasis to the point that he wishes to expand on.⁷⁷

A more complicated example is provided by c) in Table 4. Although Abbott isolates 6:38, 42 to illustrate his point, just within this immediate dialogue variations on Jesus' claim to be the bread from heaven are repeated four times, twice through DIQ:

John 6:33 (Jesus): "The bread of life is that which descends from heaven (ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ)."

John 6:35 (Jesus): "I am the bread of life."

John 6:38 (Jesus): "...because I have come down from heaven (καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ)..."⁷⁸

John 6:41 (narrator): So the Jews were grumbling about him because he said, "I am the bread that descends from heaven (ὁ καταβάς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ),"

John 6:42 (the Jews): And they were saying, "Is this not Jesus, the son of Joseph...? How does he now say, 'From heaven I have descended (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα)'?"

⁷⁶ See Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 455: "There is great rhetorical power in the altered word order, for by placing ἄνδρα first the emphasis is on what the woman does not have... It is as if Jesus had said, 'Lady, you are quite correct: you've got somebody at home, but he's not your husband!' The following verse indicates that this is exactly why the word order was altered."

⁷⁷ Wallace (*Greek Grammar*, 455) also notes that the word order is harmonized in κ and D, but that they change the woman's word order rather than Jesus'. Abbott (*Grammar*, 409 n. 1) claims that keeping the woman's phrasing "would have been liable to a momentary misunderstanding," but this is likely due to his belief that John generally follows ὅτι with indirect speech and the audience would initially hear Jesus say, "You have rightly said that I do not have a husband" (*Grammar*, 162-63; see the Appendix for a refutation of this position). Even so, Abbott continues, "emphasis... seems to me the main cause of the change," without unpacking what change of emphasis would be accomplished.

⁷⁸ John 6:38 is the only case where ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (possibly inspired by LXX Wis 16:20) is used instead of ἐκ in John, although they are often taken as synonymous (e.g. C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978], 294). Given the highly repetitious nature of the discussion here, it is probably a case of *variatio*.

It is only in the fourth variation that “from heaven” is moved to the front, which suggests that something beyond compulsively inverting the word order for stylistic effect, as Abbott presents it, is going on. In fact, the Jews originally introduced the phrase in a citation of Scripture (6:31): “Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, just as it is written, ‘He gave them bread *from heaven* (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) to eat’.”⁷⁹ Jesus picks up this phrasing in the verses that follow, but it is Jesus who introduces the idea that the bread of God *descends* from heaven in 6:33, and this element is foregrounded. He repeats his own phrasing and emphasis again in 6:38, and the narrator follows in 6:41. It is only when the Jews quote Jesus that “from heaven” is contrastively foregrounded while Jesus’ descent is deemphasized by placing it later in the sentence. The Jews are still focused on how Jesus can claim to be *from heaven*, first because this whole discussion is in response to a scriptural citation about bread from heaven (so Jesus has to establish how he is the bread),⁸⁰ and second because they know his family, which argues that Jesus is rather from the neighborhood (i.e. human) than from heaven. Again the resulting emphases align with the

⁷⁹ The precise source of the citation is disputed: for example, Peder Borgen traces it to LXX Exod 16:15 (*Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* [Leiden: Brill, 1981], 28-58, followed by Lincoln, *John*, 227-28, Moloney, *John*, 213, and von Wahlde, *John*, 2:301), while Menken traces it to LXX Ps 78 (77):24 (*Old Testament Quotations*, 50-53; see above n. 20), and he is followed by Diana M. Swancutt, “Hungers Assuage by the Bread from Heaven: ‘Eating Jesus’ as Isaian Call to Belief—the Confluence of Isaiah 55 and Psalm 78 (77) in John 6.22-71,” in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (ed. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 218-51. Keener, *John*, 1:678, and Brown, *John*, 1:262 allow for the influence of multiple traditions. All scholars, however, agree that Exod 16:4 influenced the citation through the importation of ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

⁸⁰ Anticipating the discussion of substitution, notice that, although the word order has yet to be altered in 6:41 when the quotation is technically given in the voice of the narrator but from the perspective of the Jews, the concern for Jesus’ claim to be “from heaven” is already evident: where he claimed, “I am the bread of life,” they grumble because he said, “I am the bread *that descended from heaven*.”

concerns of each character: Jesus and the narrator are concerned with Jesus' cosmic movements, his *descent*;⁸¹ the Jews are concerned with Jesus' claim to be *from heaven*.

An additional point should be made here in anticipation of later arguments. The Jews have severely truncated Jesus' full statement, which is that he has descended from heaven *not in order to do his own will but the will of the one who sent him* (6:38). That he does not do his own will is arguably the main point of Jesus' statement and a point that he will continuously try (and fail) to communicate to them (cf. 5:18; 7:17-18, 28; 8:13-14, 28, 42; 10:33). In the immediate context, Jesus defines the will of the one who sent him: that whoever sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life (6:40). They grumble because Jesus says that he is the bread that descended *from heaven* while ignoring that Jesus said that he is the bread *of life* (6:35; cf. 6:48). The one alteration (subtraction) aligns with the other (transposition): the unbelieving Jews continue to be more concerned with whether Jesus fulfills their expectations of God as they understand them than with hearing his message about eternal life. This is not to say that Jesus being from heaven is an unimportant point—arguably Jesus himself shifts focus to just that issue as the dispute goes on⁸²—but limiting one's focus to this sole issue causes Jesus' audience to fail to understand his larger point: that eternal life is possible through him.

⁸¹ The descent of divine or angelic beings from heaven (most often ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) is a common enough phrase in the NT (10-12 times; cf. Mark 1:10 // Matt 3:16 // Luke 3:22; Matt 28:2; Luke 9:54; Acts 7:34; 10:11; 11:5; 14:11; 1 Thess 4:16; Eph 4:10; James 1:17), but it is most common in the Johannine literature (at least 20 times; cf. John 1:32, 33, 51; 3:13; [5:4]; 6:33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58; Rev 3:12; 10:1; 13:13; 16:21; 18:1; 20:1, 9; 21:2, 10).

⁸² As Abbott recognizes (*Grammar*, 407-8 n. 6), the construction “descended from heaven” occurs seven times in this discourse (6:33, 38, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58); Jesus gives the word order “from heaven descended” only after the Jews interrupt him and modify his word order (6:50-58). First, this is not the only time that Jesus adopts the phrasing of an audience with limited understanding (cf. 16:16-19 with the disciples).

We can see a confluence of emphases in the remaining cases as well. The first time that Jesus tells Nathanael, “under the fig tree I saw you” (1:48), the pertinent information is Nathanael’s location—Jesus has no reason to know where Nathanael was prior to their meeting, as the latter’s amazed reaction underlines (1:49). “Being under the fig tree” is the datum that proves Jesus’ special knowledge. When Jesus asks him if he believes “because I told you, ‘I saw you under the fig tree’” (1:50), the focus has shifted to Jesus and his ability to *see* Nathanael’s whereabouts before even meeting him; it is no longer the location itself that is particularly important but Jesus’ knowledge of it, so the fig tree is de-emphasized. Indeed Jesus uses the focus on seeing to segue into promises of more important sights/visions: *Nathanael* will see greater things than these (1:50), even the sky opening and the angels ascending and descending on the Son of Man (1:51).

In the final two examples the paraphrase goes beyond re-ordering the words. The first case involves a subtraction, and the second a substitution that imposes a shift of case from accusative to genitive. However, if we focus on how the words are re-arranged then we find again that the transposition aligns with shifts in focus within the discussion. Jesus introduces his own death into the Tabernacles discussion, at best obliquely, in 8:21 when he declares that he is going away. The hostile Jews, he says, will seek him but “in your sin you will die.” Jesus’ focus has been and will continue to be on his hostile audience in

Second, there is an oft-noted shift in focus around 6:51 from *the life* that Jesus provides, to *Jesus himself* as the heavenly Son of Man whose flesh and blood must be consumed; that is, focus shifts from the gift to the giver, if not absolutely. Perhaps under these circumstances it is appropriate that the focus should shift from his actions (he has descended/gives life) to his origins (he is in fact from heaven). For a survey of various ways that the shift in interpretation of the bread has been understood, see P. André Feuillet, “L’Eucharistie, le Sacrifice du Calvaire et le Sacerdoce du Christ d’après quelques données du quatrième Évangile: Comparaison avec les Synoptiques et l’Épître aux Hébreux,” *DCV* 29/2 (1985): 103-49, here 104-7.

the latter half of the Tabernacles discourse: *they* do not know where is from (8:14); *they* judge by human standards (8:15); *they* do not know Jesus or his Father (8:19); and now, *they* will die in their sin.⁸³ However, the Jews misunderstand him by wondering whether Jesus has said he is going away because he intends to kill himself (8:22), quoting the final clause exactly.⁸⁴ Jesus' death, although always in the background, is not the explicit point of his statement. He reminds them of this by quoting the relevant clause and repeating it (8:24): "I told you, '*you will die* in your sins,' for unless you believe that I am, you will die in your sins."⁸⁵ Admittedly the contrast would have been strengthened by the introduction of a second person pronoun ("I won't die in my sins, *you* will"), but nonetheless the focus has shifted back to their deaths rather than his own—the immediate point at issue in this interruption—while keeping sins in mind until it can be brought back into the discussion a few verses later (8:34).

At the end of this debate is a more complex statement about death. For clarity, the wording as first stated by Jesus and then by the Jews is as follows:

John 8:51 (Jesus): "If anyone should keep my word, he will never see death forever."

ἐάν τις τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

⁸³ We might add the following: *they* are from below/of this world (8:23); he has much to say and to condemn concerning *them* (8:26); *they* will lift up the Son of Man (8:28).

⁸⁴ Since this quotation follows quickly on the original statement, it is at minimum evidence that John is not a slave to his stylistic impulses as Abbott describes them, in which case we might expect a word-order reversal here.

⁸⁵ Attention was already drawn to the change in number, from sin to sins, above (chapter 1 n. 15). One of Theon's earlier exercises leading up to paraphrase proper is modifying a chreia according to number, rephrasing singular statements in the plural and vice versa (see *Prog.* 99-101).

John 8:52 (the Jews): “If anyone should keep my word, he will never taste death forever.”

ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσῃ, οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

In the first clause of Jesus’ statement, we notice that Jesus’ “my word” (τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον) becomes τὸν λόγον μου when the Jews quote him.⁸⁶ One larger structural observation is that Jesus’ statement twice uses accusative constructions (ἐμὸν and θάνατον) positioned earlier in the clauses, while the Jews twice use genitive constructions (μου and θανάτου) placed later.⁸⁷ We might just have two versions of a logion using two different but consistent grammatical constructions.⁸⁸ However, as Helma Dik points out, “by default, adjectives follow their nouns, and this will also be the preferred order if the noun is the most salient element in the noun phrase; if, however, the modifier is contrastive, or otherwise the most salient element... it will precede the noun.”⁸⁹ The tendency for the adjective to follow the noun holds for John, where possessive modifiers follow λόγος *every-*

⁸⁶ On alternative word orders in minority readings, see the Appendix.

⁸⁷ While there are some differences, an exercise that Theon assigns before paraphrase is the inflection (κλίσις) of a chreia into the various cases; that is, a chreia stated in the nominative is systematically restated in the accusative, genitive, dative, and vocative (*Prog.* 99-101). A student at the very beginning of the exercises would have had practice reformulating statements into different cases without intending any shift in meaning. The shift from accusative to genitive may serve the other indicators of emphasis, it may only match the shift in the second clause imposed by the substitution of “taste” (with the genitive of “death,” as it appears in all other occurrences, even with different objects), or it could be a case of *variatio*.

⁸⁸ So Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (London: Oliphants, 1972), 332-33.

⁸⁹ Dik, *Word Order*, 39. Although Dik specifically examines tragedy in this book, her argument is that word order in less prosaic, more spoken Greek (as one would find in drama) is not dictated by meter alone but by the need to convey information to an audience. The Fourth Gospel is also a performative text, i.e. given the high rates of illiteracy in the first century, most of its audience most likely *heard* it read aloud rather than read it themselves. John prefers τὸν λόγον μου (cf. 14:23, 24; 15:20, all three with some form of τηρέω following), which aligns with Dik’s summary statement; the closest John comes to Jesus’ phrasing in 8:51 is several verses earlier when Jesus uses τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν (8:43, with ἀκούω preceding). For more on the Gospel of John as dramatic or performance literature, see Jo-Ann Brant, *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004).

where except for 8:51 (19 out of 20 total cases)!⁹⁰ If the altered wording is suggestive, then Jesus seems to say, “If anyone should keep *my* word”⁹¹ while the Jews respond with a phrasing closer to, “If anyone should keep *my word*.”⁹² Given the expression of disbelief that precedes the quotation, we might begin to understand their doubts: Abraham and the prophets received many favors from God, yet they died; how will Jesus’ mere *word* grant an even greater favor?

Ignoring the change from “see” to “taste” in the second clause, we also notice that the verbal construction follows the object (“death [s]he will never see”) in Jesus’ phrasing but comes first in that of the Jews.⁹³ When Jesus gives the saying, he introduces a new *topic*: death. His *focus*, however, is on the promise that such a person *will not see it*

⁹⁰ The cases with the modifier following some form of λόγος include 8:52 as well as 4:39, 41; 5:24, 38; 8:37, 43, 55 10:35; 12:38; 14:23, 24; 15:20; 17:6, 14, 17, 20; 18:32. The results for ῥῆμα are less skewed, with three cases where the modifier follows the noun (8:47; 10:21; 15:7) and two preceding it (5:47; 12:47). For λαλιά, the results are split between following the noun (8:43) and preceding it (4:42).

⁹¹ See also the strongly emphatic ἐγώ in 8:45: “But *I*, because I speak the truth (ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω), you do not believe me.” There is a shift in focus in the following verses from Jesus to his audience and its inability to hear *the words of God* (see 8:47), which perhaps prompts them to shift focus back to Jesus with accusations of being a Samaritan and of demon possession (8:48, possibly using DIQ; see below). The contrast continues: *Jesus* honors his Father while *they* dishonor Jesus and, implicitly, are judged (8:49-50). It is at this point that Jesus breaks in with a double amen about the benefits of keeping *his* word (which is God’s word) in particular.

⁹² See Abbott, *Grammar*, 415-17; although he does not address 8:51-52 specifically, he argues that the μου construction emphasizes the object (here Jesus’ word) while the ἐμός construction (intervening between the article and the noun) emphasizes “my,” to the extent of: “mine and nobody else’s.” Compare also 4:42: “We no longer believe because of *your* word (τὴν σὴν λαλίαν).”

⁹³ In every case where the phrase “taste death” is used in the NT (cf. Mark 9:1 // Matt 16:28 // Luke 9:27; Heb 2:9; also *Sib. Or.* 1.82), “death” follows “taste” so that we might say this word order is simply more likely than not, although as *P. Oxy.* 654 ([θανάτου] οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται) and perhaps 4 Ezra 6:26 (*mortem non gustaverunt* = θανάτου οὐκ ἐγεύσαντο [?]) show, it is not a necessary word order (for Greek retroversion of 4 Ezra, see Schlatter, *Johannes*, 218). Moreover, in the two other cases of *seeing death* in the NT (Luke 2:26; Heb 11:5), “death” follows “see” (ἰδεῖν θάνατον), unlike in John. In both cases, the phrase has the sense of literal, physical death.

forever.⁹⁴ Death loses its topic function (it is no longer new or contrastive) when the sentence is repeated by the Jews and is thus moved after the verb; this allows their focus to remain on the verb: how can Jesus say that any person who keeps his word *will never taste* death when even the patriarchs and the prophets died? Since changing the word order retains the focus on the verb, the paraphrase highlights the modification in wording as well (“see” to “taste”), and in this sense only is Neyrey correct that the paraphrase is “evidence that they do not ‘keep my words’.”⁹⁵ The modified word order actually serves to maintain the focus where Jesus placed it. Instead, it is the contrast that the Jews create—between the patriarchs who physically died and Jesus’ apparent promise that those who obey him never will—that is presented as a misinterpretation of Jesus’ words. The paraphrase serves John’s characterization of the Jews.

In each of the cases that Abbott credits mainly to stylistic concerns⁹⁶ (and which some of his followers credit *exclusively* to stylistic concerns),⁹⁷ the modified word order

⁹⁴ Two things to note here: first, on *focus* in terms of word order, see also Dik, *Word Order*, 42-44 (on topic, see above n. 39). *Focus* is an “element expressing the information that the speaker considers the most urgent part of the message” (*Word Order*, 32), in this case, that one will not see death (if one keeps Jesus’ word). Both topic and focus have emphatic function in the clause. Second, the phrase εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα seems to play the role of a *tail* (“when a speaker adds an extra constituent to a complete clause, by way of afterthought, further specification, or correction;” *Word Order*, 35) and thus does not move. For a similar set of observations without reference to topic and focus, note for example Darrell L. Bock (*Jesus According to Scripture* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002], 468): “Jesus’ statement is doubly emphatic, using οὐ μὴ [focus] and placing the Greek word for ‘death’ (θάνατος) at the front of the clause [topic].”

⁹⁵ Neyrey, *John*, 166 (see above, chapter 1 n. 13).

⁹⁶ Abbott (*Grammar*, 431-32) later includes 9:21 (“ask him, he is of age”) and 9:23 (“he is of age, ask him”) in the category of inversions. Here we might agree with Abbott that the modification is stylistic, although we can speculate: the parents, who are being uncomfortably interrogated, foreground the request that the Jews instead question their son; the narrator meanwhile may either wish to segue to the man’s interrogation (and thus places the request to ask him last) or to foreground his legal status as a witness (so Brown, *John*, 1:374). In either case, there is nothing to prevent the authors from indulging this particular form of *variatio*.

also aligns with the concerns of each particular character. Since there are many more close cases where the text *fails* to modify the word order in quotation, arguably John only indulges its stylistic tendency to transpose words when doing so reflects the concerns of the characters, i.e. when it is useful.

We might also observe that John orders words efficaciously even when the quoted statements are far apart and not simply inverted. For example, when Jesus first tells Nicodemus that it is necessary for the Son of Man to be lifted up (3:14), it is in the context of an analogy with the bronze serpent: “Just as Moses lifted up (ὑψωσεν) the serpent in the desert, so also must be lifted up (ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ) the Son of Man.” The parallelism dictates the topic of the second clause (the lifting up, not its necessity), which draws the verb ὑψόω to the front. After Jesus’ third ‘lifting up’ saying (12:32; cf. 8:28), the crowd is baffled. They have heard that the Christ remains forever; how can Jesus say, “The Son of Man must be lifted up (δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι)” (12:34)? Ignoring the narrative problem of how the crowd happens to land nearly on Jesus’ precise wording from a private conversation that took place nine chapters (of narrative time) and two years (of story time) earlier,⁹⁸ as well as how they inferred that the Son of Man was relevant to a question about the Christ, the parallelism with the lifting up of the serpent is no longer in view. John may freely put

⁹⁷ Morris calls the tendency to alter the word order “habitual” (*Studies*, 306) and “no more than the sign of a desire to avoid a monotonous style to introduce variety under such circumstances” (p. 318). Chang more or less throws his hands in the air because, “Sometimes we should be content to realize that the language is more capricious and viable to variation” (*Repetitions and Variations*, 93).

⁹⁸ J.-G. Gourbillon (“La parabole du serpent d’airain,” *RB* 51 [1942]: 213-26) argues that John 3:14-21 was originally situated between 12:31 and 32, so that the crowd would be directly quoting the phrase currently situated in 3:14. Ludger Schenke (“Der ‘Dialog Jesu mit den Juden’ im Johannesevangelium: Ein Rekonstruktionsversuch,” *NTS* 34 [1988]: 573-603) argues instead that 12:34-36 was displaced from the chapter 3 material. Displacement solutions such as these are not testable without manuscript evidence, and neither has found much influence. See chapter 4 below for a possible solution.

δεῖ prior to the verb because it is seemingly his preference (seven times pre-verbal; twice post-verbal).⁹⁹ More speculatively, the pre-verbal and indeed initial position of δεῖ may be contrastive: “We have heard from the law that the Christ remains *forever*, and so evidently *will never be lifted up*, i.e. killed (cf. 12:33). How can you say, ‘*It is necessary* that the Son of Man be lifted up’?”¹⁰⁰

Addition in Greco-Roman and Jewish Contexts

Teresa Morgan notes that paraphrases in school-hand papyri almost never expand on the original text. The pseudo-philosophical paraphrase of the *Iliad* presented above is the only example that has survived: “All the others... excerpt from, shorten and simplify the original narrative.”¹⁰¹ Yet additions combined with substitution are found often in elaborations of chreiai from Theon forward. As early as the *Progymnasmata* of Hermogenes, the paraphrase of a chreia is meant “not to express it simply but rather by amplifying the presentation.”¹⁰² Hermogenes is followed closely by Priscian, who urges his students not to recite the chreia just as it is, “but rather express it more fully.”¹⁰³ Neither, however, provides an example as Theon does when he recites a chreia about

⁹⁹ δεῖ appears before the verb in 3:7, 30; 4:4, 24; 10:16; 12:34; and 20:9; δεῖ appears after the verb in 3:14 and 4:20, both involved in DIQ.

¹⁰⁰ Such a contrast acknowledges that the Jews have understood that Jesus’ “lifting up” implies his death, ostensibly with the benefit of the narrator’s clarification in 12:33 (Lincoln, *John*, 353).

¹⁰¹ Morgan, *Literate Education*, 209. We may have a clue regarding the relative absence of additions, in school-hand and even in John, in a comment by Quintilian (10.5.11): “The real sign of high quality (*virtutis indicium*) is the capacity to expand what is by nature brief, amplify the insignificant... and speak well and at length on a limited subject.” That is, even with his sink or swim attitude toward paraphrase, expansion is presented as the most advanced stage before the student moves on to exercises that are everywhere else the proper domain of the rhetor, not the grammarian.

¹⁰² Text and translation in Hock and O’Neil, *Progymnasmata*, 176-77.

¹⁰³ Text and translation in Hock and O’Neil, *Progymnasmata*, 196-97.

Epameinondas the Theban general who said, dying childless at Mantinea: “I have left two daughters—the victory at Leuctra and the one at Mantinea.” The elaboration reads:

Stop weeping, friends, for I have left you two immortal daughters: two victories of our country over the Lacedaemonians, the one at Leuctra, who is the older, and the younger, who is just now being born at Mantinea.¹⁰⁴

As Theon presents it, the main benefit of these expansions is to incorporate contextual elements into both the presentation of the logion (which is also greatly expanded here) and the logion itself. As we will see, this applies also to John’s only clear case of addition.

Occasionally in the biblical narratives a speech act is extended in quotation, whether by “adding a parallel synonymous phrase, as in Gen. 24:40 [quoting 24:7], or by expanding a verbal chain, as in Gen. 44:23.”¹⁰⁵ When quotations are used by one character against another, as is frequently the case, additions may serve to draw out and clarify the offense they have committed. Savran gives an example from Judges: Gideon asks the men of Succoth for food because his men are exhausted (עייפים) and they are in pursuit of the kings of Midian (8:5). In response, the men of Succoth ask whether Gideon already has these kings in his hand “that we should give bread *to your army*” (8:6). The

¹⁰⁴ See Hock and O’Neil, *Progymnasmata*, 100-103. Theon gives another example within his discussion of addition proper: he claims that a line in Thucydides (1.142.1), “Opportunities for actions do not wait,” is paraphrased by Demosthenes (4.37) as, “Opportunities for actions do not wait *for our delays and procrastinations*.” Theon’s quotation of Thucydides is not quite accurate as we have the text of the latter, which reads instead, “Opportunities for *war* do not wait.” Since Theon makes a point of saying that in *addition* one does not substitute any of the given words, it is unclear whether the harmonization of Thucydides and Demosthenes occurred 1) in the text that Theon received, 2) in the transmission/translation of Theon’s text, or whether 3) Theon fudged the wording a little himself to provide a good example for his students.

¹⁰⁵ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 32. In Gen 24:7, Abraham tells his servant that Yhwh “will send his angel *before* you.” In Gen 24:40, the servant quotes him as saying that Yhwh “will send his angel *with you and make your way successful*.” A bit of substitution is also evident in the move from אֶתְּךָ לַפְּנִיךָ (followed by the LXX: ἐμπροσθεν in 24:7, μετά in 24:40).

judge leaves Succoth and captures the two kings without their help. When he returns, Gideon mockingly quotes them as doubting that he had Zebah and Zalmunna in his hand “that we should give bread *to your* exhausted (היעפים) *men*” (8:15), incorporating his own concerns into the quotation and strengthening his accusation against the men of Succoth.¹⁰⁶ Gideon then punishes them since they should have fed his tired soldiers. Some of the additions in the Hebrew Bible significantly alter the original statement while others add little to the quotation. Even with 18 cases of lengthening, its extent “tends to be quite limited, both in the number of texts that exhibit additions and in the extent of those additions.”¹⁰⁷

Addition in the Gospel of John

As in the school-hand papyri and even more so than in the OT, additions are very rare in the Gospel of John. The only clear example in the Fourth Gospel¹⁰⁸ occurs in the final chapter as Peter, walking with the risen Jesus, notices the Beloved Disciple following after them:

¹⁰⁶ The addition in Judges 8:15 is kept in the Greek even if the tradition behind A and B differ on how to translate it, respectively using ἐκλελυμένοις (“exhausted,” changed from πεινῶσιν, “are hungry,” in 8:5) and ἐκλείπουσιν (“abandoned,” matching 8:5 exactly and the more typical verb to translate יעף). In the Hebrew and in both Greek traditions, Gideon paraphrases the noun in 8:15: while the men of Succoth referred to his army (לצבאך), Gideon quotes them as referring to his men (לאנשיך). Here the Greek traditions differ in the original statement as well as in the quotation: “men” (ἀνδράσιν) appears in 8:15 as in the Hebrew, but in 8:6 A uses “army” (στρατιᾷ) where B uses “power” (δυνάμει). In either case, a substitution and an addition occur in both Greek traditions, neither of which harmonizes the quotations.

¹⁰⁷ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 32.

¹⁰⁸ Other examples are unclear because some paraphrases may be viewed as a combination of modifications where the resultant phrase is longer. In these cases, I have chosen to consider them as substitutive paraphrases that are unlike 21:20, where material is simply appended to the statement quoted in 13:25. See also below on John 8:48 for another possible addition.

John 21:20: Peter turned and saw the disciple whom Jesus loved following, the one who also reclined upon his chest during the supper and said, “Lord, who is the one who hands you over?” (κύριε, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παραδιδούς σε;)

The quotation refers to the first appearance of the Beloved Disciple:

John 13:25: So that one, leaning thus on Jesus’ chest, said to him, “Lord, who is it?” (κύριε, τίς ἐστὶν;)

No alterations are made to the brief question of the Beloved Disciple quoted in 13:25; only the words “the one who hands you over” are added.¹⁰⁹ The person whom the Beloved Disciple is asking about is clearer in 13:25: Jesus predicts that one of his disciples will betray him (13:21) and Peter immediately nods to the Beloved Disciple to find out who Jesus was talking about (13:24). Yet now it has been eight chapters and the narrator is seemingly concerned to remind his audience of pertinent information, in narrative details, in the introduction of the quotation, and in the quotation itself. Perhaps the narrator does not trust that his listeners will recall who the subject of the Disciple’s question was, or perhaps, in a post-resurrection scene that juxtaposes Peter and the Disciple in order to support the latter while recognizing the former, the narrator wants to underline the Beloved Disciple’s physical proximity to Jesus in the important pre-resurrection context of his final meal, and that the Beloved Disciple had access to information to which Peter did not.¹¹⁰ What should be noted here is that additions *never occur in*

quotations of what Jesus has said. Even in this case, the Beloved Disciple is about to be

¹⁰⁹ It may be worth noting that in the two other cases where a vocative leads the quoted statement (14:8; 21:17), it is eliminated in quotation. There it may only have been that the address was not important enough to include. Here κύριε appears in the quotation, which makes more sense given both that the narrator expands the statement (an abridgement is perhaps beside the point) and that the narrator may want to retain the Beloved Disciple’s address to Jesus as ‘Lord’ now that it has acquired a more definite religious aspect, post-resurrection (cp. especially 20:28; 21:7, 12, 15, 16, 17; see von Wahlde, *John*, 1:237-41).

¹¹⁰ Lincoln, *John*, 520.

identified with the author (21:24, although the term ‘authority’ is perhaps more appropriate¹¹¹), so perhaps under these remarkable circumstances it is less of a violation to expand on words credited to him.

If the Beloved Disciple’s question about Jesus’ betrayer is the only clear case of addition, there is another case that may perhaps be taken as one. In John 7:20, a crowd exclaims to Jesus in surprise, “You have a demon! (δαιμόνιον ἔχεις)” after he accuses them of wanting to kill him (cf. 7:19). While the exclamation could be read as a formal charge tied to manipulating the demon to perform magic, it might only be a way for a baffled crowd to distance itself from the charge that Jesus has laid against them, more akin to blurting out, “You’re crazy!”¹¹² Toward the end of the same debate, the Jews reply to Jesus in the following way:

John 8:48: Οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς ὅτι Σαμαρείτης εἶ σὺ καὶ δαιμόνιον ἔχεις;

The last two words are an exact repetition of 7:20. There are significant difficulties with the phrasing here,¹¹³ but it is possible to read it as, “Do we not rightly say, ‘You are a Samaritan and you have a demon’?” If so, then it presents another addition: the charge of

¹¹¹ E.g. Moloney, *John*, 561.

¹¹² Keener (*John*, 1:714-15) allows both readings, supporting the idea of a formal charge: “because sorcery carried a capital sentence in biblical law (Exod 22:18; cf. Rev 21:8; 22:15), the charge functions ironically: at the very moment they accuse him of having a demon, they profess to be unaware of who might wish to kill him (7:20)!” The association with insanity is clearer when the charge of demon possession appears again in 10:20: “He has a demon and he’s insane—who can listen to him?” We also see the accusation of demon possession leveled at John the Baptist in the Synoptic tradition only because he fasted (δαιμόνιον ἔχει; Luke 7:33 // Matt 11:18). Still, a similar construction is used with regards to the Gadarene demoniac in a case of actual possession (ἔχων δαιμόνια; Luke 8:27), so we cannot rule out a literal interpretation.

¹¹³ Among them: the present tense (“we say”) may not refer to a specific speech act but to a general charge going around about Jesus; the καὶ may separate two quotations (“we say, ‘You are a Samaritan’, and, ‘You have a demon’”), although we might expect a second ὅτι (cp. John 14:28); and at any rate, the ὅτι and the combination of persons allows an indirect quotation (“we say *that* you are a Samaritan and you have a demon”).

being a Samaritan is added to the charge of demon possession. Accusing Jesus of being a Samaritan is more appropriate in chapter 8 than in either John 7 because here one of the main points that Jesus has been debating with the Jews is physical and spiritual *heritage*, descent from Abraham (8:33, 37, 39, 53, 56) and from God (8:41, 47, 54) as opposed to descent through fornication (8:41) or from the Devil (8:44).¹¹⁴ Given the perceived mixed ancestry of the Samaritans as well as their association with illegitimacy by first century Jews,¹¹⁵ it is precisely during this discussion that they would want to add an accusation of Samaritan heritage in support of the established charge of demon possession. The additional charge only heightens the principal one.¹¹⁶ While it is not absolutely clear that John expands the demon possession accusation in 8:48 as he does the Beloved Disciple's

¹¹⁴ Brown (*John*, 1:358), citing John Mehlman ("John 8,48 in Some Patristic Quotations," *Biblica* 44 [1963]: 206-9), says that the charge of being illegitimate ('born of fornication') is added to some patristic citations of 8:48, but this is not strictly the case. Mehlman shows instead that, when presenting lists of Jewish accusations against Jesus, the Church Fathers often collect them from several texts including John 8:41 ("We are not born of fornication," but seemingly filtered through the *Acts of Pilate* which takes 8:41 as a preterition, so that it becomes a direct accusation against Jesus that *he* was born illegitimately) and 8:48 (Samaritan and demon-possessed), along with several other texts. As Mehlman points out (p. 209), when dealing directly with John 8:48 the Fathers avoid importing the charge of illegitimacy.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 268: "In light of the fact that the entire present controversy revolves around paternity, and that Jesus has insulted the Jews' own sense of paternity by Abraham their ancestor, this may best be seen as a riposte slandering Jesus' paternity in return: if he says that the Jews are of their 'father the devil' (8:44), he will be charged with having been birthed by a Samaritan!" See also Keener, *John*, 1:764.

¹¹⁶ The author of *On Political Discourse* 68-70 (Ps.-Aristides, 2nd or 3rd century CE) discusses expansions in the context of a form of preterition (here labelled ὑπόστασις), where instead of saying something definite ("the blows he inflicted on me *were terrible*") one uses an indefinite phrase to invite an expansion ("the blows he inflicted on me *were such* that neither I nor my doctors thought I would heal"). That is not quite what the Jews are doing here, nor is the ὑπόστασις discussed by Ps.-Aristides a true preterition, as Jesus uses earlier (8:26, "I have many things to say and to judge concerning you [which are what?], but the one who sent me is true, and the things that I have heard from him, these I speak to the world"). However, it may be relevant that this form of defective preterition is only employed to allow the orator to strengthen arguments against his opponents in each of the examples given by Ps.-Aristides. John likewise uses both of its (potential) expansions to highlight faults in the speakers' opponents: the Jews add that Jesus is a Samaritan, and the narrator adds that the Beloved Disciple asked about "the one who is betraying you" rather than, say, "the one you were talking about" (cf. 13:24). See Michel Patillon, ed. and trans., *Pseudo-Aelius Aristide: Arts Rhétoriques: Le Discours Politique* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002), 126-28.

question in 21:20, in either case the additions align with patterns we find in similar paraphrases in the Old Testament and in the *Progymnasmata*: they incorporate contextual clues that harmonize with the perspective of the paraphraser and expand on accusations against a perceived enemy.

Subtraction in Greco-Roman and Jewish Contexts

In Theon's *Progymnasmata* (140), paraphrase by subtraction is presented simply as the opposite of addition. No examples are given by Theon, although we may turn to Demosthenes for an extreme case. In *Against Meidias*, Demosthenes argues that when Meidias insolently assaulted him while he was crowned as a chorus-master at the Dionysia, the latter was guilty of *hybris* against not only Demosthenes but against the city itself. More than that, he is guilty of impiety since the performances of choruses have been ordained by the gods (see 21.51-52). In support, Demosthenes cites two oracles (21.53) that are only marginally relevant: both discuss the ritual honoring of gods, but neither at the regular Dionysia.¹¹⁷ The first oracle insists on covering the head with crowns (στεφάνοις πυκάζαντας) when giving thanks to Dionysus, and on the establishment of choruses and wearing of crowns in honor of the Olympian gods. People are also to raise their hands in memory of the gods "according to tradition" (κατὰ τὰ πάτρια). The oracle's weakness as support for his argument is probably reflected in its initial position: the more relevant oracle is placed second so Demosthenes can transition into his

¹¹⁷ Douglas M. MacDowell, ed. and trans., *Demosthenes: Against Meidias (Oration 21)* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 270-73.

argument.¹¹⁸ The second oracle commands the performance of rites for Dionysus (among other gods): to mix bowls of wine, to establish choruses and to wear crowns (χορούς ἱστάναι καὶ στεφανηφορεῖν), and also to take one day's holiday.

While Demosthenes acknowledges that the oracles command sacrifice to the named gods as he comments on them, he says that they add besides (προσαναιροῦσιν) that the citizens should “establish choruses and wear crowns (ἱστάναι δὲ χορούς καὶ στεφανηφορεῖν) in accordance with tradition (κατὰ τὰ πάτρια), in addition to all the oracles which come on every occasion” (21.54).¹¹⁹ Since most of the quoted laws are irrelevant to his case, Demosthenes eliminates all but the seven words that are indeed relevant. Doing so not only exposes his point of concern with the speech acts quoted, but also directs his audience's attention where he needs it to be.

As it is in the school-hand manuscripts, Savran calls shortening of statements an “overwhelming tendency,” occurring in over three-quarters of the quotations.¹²⁰ This may be quite natural since it is not often the entire speech complex that is relevant, but particular ideas or phrases. Therefore on many occasions only information or statements that

¹¹⁸ Regarding the weakness of the oracles, MacDowell (*Demosthenes*, 270) goes so far as to say, “it is possible that whoever put the documents into *Meidias* after [Demosthenes'] death has selected the wrong oracles from the collection.” I disagree for the reasons outlined.

¹¹⁹ Translation taken from MacDowell, *Demosthenes*, 121. Although the first oracle does command them to establish choruses and to wear crowns (ἱστάμεν καὶ χορούς, καὶ στεφανηφορεῖν), Demosthenes' phrasing picks up on that of the second oracle in order to progress neatly into his own argument. The phrase “according to tradition” seems to be attached to the raising of hands in the first oracle, but Demosthenes quotes in a way that implies that it should be connected to the wearing of crowns instead (a move facilitated by its position in the oracle). In addition to inverting the order of the oracles from which he extracts (second oracle first) Demosthenes plays with word order in ways that support his points.

¹²⁰ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 29.

are pertinent to the new situation are repeated,¹²¹ as in God's invocation of the command to Adam:

Gen 2:16-17: And Yhwh God commanded the man saying, "You may freely eat from any tree in the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and bad, *do not eat of it*, for on the day that you eat you will surely die."

Gen 3:17: "...and you have eaten of the tree of which I commanded you saying, '*Do not eat of it!*'"

The quotation is exact as far as the three words that God quotes,¹²² but God abridges both the beginning of the statement (including the allowance to eat of any other tree and the particular tree from which Adam should not eat) and its end (the threat of death). What is pertinent in the current context, where God has approached Adam after eating the fruit, is that *God told him not to!* That is what is re-quoted.¹²³

Subtraction in the Gospel of John

In a sense, almost every quotation in John is a subtraction.¹²⁴ The phrases that are quoted, even without obvious modification, are originally embedded in larger speech complexes, sometimes many sentences long. By picking up only one of these phrases in quotation, the quoting character highlights what is important to him,¹²⁵ or what is the

¹²¹ Savran, *Telling and Retelling*, 30.

¹²² LXX Gen 3:17 gives an indirect quote (see above, chapter 1 nn. 71-72).

¹²³ These verses present a longstanding problem in that Adam does not in fact die *that day*, but centuries later (Ps 90:4, "for a thousand years are like yesterday" notwithstanding). Even if we accept an interpretation wherein God meant that on that day Adam would become mortal, we may still understand why omitting the much more particular prediction given in Gen 2:17 would be attractive to the narrator.

¹²⁴ On the only fully exact quotations (John 4:10 and 18:6, 8), see below.

¹²⁵ Although women feature in multiple scenes in the Fourth Gospel, only one (direct?) quotation is given by a woman. At 4:20, the Samaritan woman quotes what she takes to be a general Jewish sentiment: "You (pl.) say, 'Jerusalem is the place where it is necessary to worship'."

specific point of dispute.¹²⁶ This focusing effect of subtraction also occurs when individual clauses within a sentence or just a few words are presented in quotation. In the example from *Protagoras*, Socrates eliminates individual words while focusing elsewhere only to reintroduce them when he wants to discuss them. Still, we may note that he expounds Simonides' meaning one sentence at a time with a similar intent: to focus his audience on the current point of dispute. While such a move directs the speaker's attention (as well as the audience's) where it needs to be, it runs the risk of exposing a misunderstanding due to a neglect of the original context. At one point Socrates draws attention to the inadequacy of his own initial paraphrase of Pittacus ("It is *bad* to be good"), an inadequacy evident in part due to the next line of the poem (341e): "God alone can have this privilege." Simonides would not be claiming that God alone can reach a state that is bad, so the context of the original statement argues against Socrates' (joking) paraphrase. As we will see, John uses subtractions, big and small, in both fashions: to focus attention on an issue, sometimes while introducing a significantly different context for the quotation, and to highlight inadequate understandings in characters who do not take account of the context of the original statement.

We will tackle some subtractions that portray the quoting parties negatively, but first a distinction should be made. Subtractions may take the form of either an *abridgement* or an *omission*. At the word-by-word level, abridgements give an incomplete rendering of the quoted statements, such as when the addressee ("Lord" in John 14:9;

¹²⁶ Günter Fischer, *Die himmlischen Wohnungen: Untersuchung zu Joh 14,2f* (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1975), 43 draws this conclusion, and adds that the accuracy of the quotations by Jesus's enemies (e.g. the Jews in 7:36; 8:22), barring subtractions, only serves to *highlight* their misunderstanding.

“Simon of John” in 21:17) or an initial command (“Go!” in 4:53) fails to appear in the quotation. An omission likewise gives an incomplete quotation, but one that is more intrusive: elements *within* the quoted speech act are eliminated. In the case of either abridgement or omission, subtracting extraneous or irrelevant material from the quotation exposes the true point of concern for the character quoting the original speech act. Unfortunately, that true point of concern may not be where it ought to be.

As a first example of misguided subtraction, there are cases of both abridgement and omission in the series of quotations that occurs in John’s story of the healing of a sick man (5:1-18). Here Jesus heals the man through a series of three imperatives (5:8): “Rise, carry your bed and walk!” When the Jews see the man carrying his bed around on a Sabbath, they question him. He responds (5:11): “The one who made me well, he told me, ‘Carry your bed and walk!’” The man has already drawn attention to the healing itself by labelling the (at present) anonymous Jesus, “the one who made me well,” so the command to rise might be superfluous and has been eliminated.¹²⁷ Perhaps more to the point, the man has been accused of breaking the Sabbath by carrying his bed as he walks, and the command to rise simply does not support his defense.¹²⁸ By highlighting that he is

¹²⁷ As recognized by Noack, *Tradition*, 137 n. 303.

¹²⁸ However, Harvey Falk (*Jesus the Pharisee: A New Look at the Jewishness of Jesus* [New York: Paulist Press, 1985], 153-54) has argued that the scene reflects a rabbinic debate where the command to rise would be important. In his reading, “the Jews” reflect the Shammaite position that the bed became *mukzah* (an object that one does not intend to use on the Sabbath) after the healing and so could not be moved, while Jesus reflects a position in which, since the state of *mukzah* developed after the Sabbath began, it could be moved. There are two problems with Falk’s argument: first, the texts he uses as precedents are Talmudic (*Betsah* 26b) or later (*Shulhan Aruckh* dates to the 16th century) and reflect a debate involving 3rd and 4th century rabbis. Considerably more work would have to be done to conclude that the argument was relevant when John was composed. Second, the debate itself is over the states of various foods (an animal that incurs a blemish or a fig that completes the drying process on the Sabbath). The only moving of an object has

only carrying his bed as he walks because Jesus told him to, he shifts the blame to Jesus (effectively so, cf. 5:16). The Jews meanwhile are not yet concerned with the healing but with the Sabbath violation, as is evident when they quote the man (5:12): “Who is the person who told you, ‘Carry and walk’?” Whereas the man abridged Jesus’ statement by eliminating the command to rise, the Jews have even omitted the object of the command to carry. It is only the carrying and walking that offends them.¹²⁹ In this series of quotations all references to the miracle have gradually been eliminated, since even the mention of the bed drew attention to the man’s former illness. Jesus is no longer the one who made him well but “the person who told” him to violate the Sabbath. In the eyes of the Jews here, this in itself is a violation by Jesus, and they have refined the quotation down

to do with a firstling that falls into a pit and suffers a permanent blemish: under these circumstances, R. Judah the Prince (3rd century) says that it may be brought up from the pit and slaughtered while others disagree because doing so would require someone to examine the animal to assess whether the blemish was permanent or not, and *this* is forbidden on the Sabbath (*Betsah* 26a). So while the debate does focus on the question of whether something can change status during the Sabbath (or a festival) and how/whether to assess that, there are several steps of interpretation necessary between examining an animal on the Sabbath (the real point at issue in *Betsah*) and subsequently moving it because it has changed status (so that it is edible and non-sacrificial), and moving a bed, not because it has physically changed but because the person’s ability to move it on the Sabbath has changed. The move away from references to the healing itself argues that the *change in status of the bed* is not the point at issue, but initially the *carrying of the bed* on the Sabbath at all, for which the healed man shifts blame to Jesus. For a more positive assessment of the lame man than mine, see Klaus Scholtissek, “Mündiger Glaube. Zur Architektur und Pragmatik johan-neischer begegnungs-geschichten: Joh 5 und 9,” in *Paulus und Johannes: Exegetische Studien zur paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie und Literatur* (ed. D. Sängler und U. Mell; WUNT 198; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 75-105.

¹²⁹ In the trial scene at the end of Achilles Tatius’ 2nd century novel *Leucippe and Clitophon* (8.1), Thersander accuses a priest of housing a runaway slave (8.1.1-2, from the LCL edition): “And you have here a slave-girl of mine, a harlot (δούλην ἐμήν, γυναῖκα μάχλον) who cannot be stopped from running after men; see that you keep her safe for me.” In first person narration, Clitophon admits that he was gravely affected by the words (πρὸς τὸ) “slave-girl” and “harlot” (δούλην καὶ γυναῖκα μάχλον), before launching his defense. Clitophon has omitted the “my” from slave-girl, perhaps because she is not legally Thersander’s slave, as he has indeed subtracted everything but the words causing him offense. For more, see chapter 3 below.

to the elements necessary in order to form an accusation against him.¹³⁰ As Jesus will argue, the potential Sabbath violation is nullified by Jesus' unique authority as the Son who, like his Father, must work even on the Sabbath (5:17). That is, Jesus does not break the Sabbath by working, and to focus on either the command to carry and walk or even the healing itself as Sabbath violations is to misunderstand the identity and the mission of Jesus.

Such misunderstandings continue during Jesus' next visit to Jerusalem when a statement that is repeated twice (with some variations) is quoted each time by the Jews.

The first case presents an abridgement:

John 7:33-34: Jesus then said, "I will be with you a little while longer, and then I am going to the one who sent me. *You will seek me, but you will not find [me]; and where I am, you cannot come.*"

John 7:35-36: The Jews said to one another, "Where does this man intend to go that we will not find him? Does he intend to go to the Dispersion among the Greeks and teach the Greeks? What is this word that he said, '*You will seek me and you will not find [me]; and where I am, you cannot come*'?"

The quotation is exact as far as it goes, but it only includes the second of two statements given by Jesus. Initially Jesus claims that he will not be among them much longer *because he is going to the one who sent him* (7:33). By ignoring the context that Jesus gives to the quoted statement, they are left guessing at what he might mean.¹³¹ When Jesus

¹³⁰ For similar opinions, see Brown, *John*, 1:208 ("the wonderful healing has been lost sight of; only the Sabbath violation is important to the authorities"); Haenchen, *John*, 1:247; Severino Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 14-15; and Martin Asiedu-Peprah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts as Juridical Controversy* (WUNT 2.132; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 69.

¹³¹ See J. N. Sanders and B.A. Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 211-12; Neyrey, *John*, 145.

repeats a close variant of the saying in the next chapter,¹³² another significant abridgement occurs—one that Jesus immediately corrects:

John 8:21: Again he said to them, “I am going away, and you will search for me, but **you will die in your sin**. *Where I am going, you cannot come.*”

John 8:22: Then the Jews said, “Is he going to kill himself, because he says ‘*Where I am going, you cannot come?*’?”

John 8:23-24: He said to them, “You are from below, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world. I told you, ‘**You will die in your sins,**’ for unless you believe that I am, you will die in your sins.

Again the Jews ignore the initial statement, although it is largely repetitious and perhaps not worth recalling. However, it seems that Jesus at least does not trust that their abridgement takes the entire speech complex into account because he draws attention to the fact that they have overlooked his important substitution: *they will die in their sin(s)*. His focus was on their deaths, and yet their ironic misunderstanding focuses on his. They have missed the larger point a second time because they have ignored the context of the statement that they quote. In both cases the Jews are not completely incorrect: Jesus *will* go to teach in the diaspora (through his disciples) and he *will* lay down his life, but these facts must be understood in the context of who Jesus is and the nature of his mission if they are not to lead his audience astray.¹³³ As he responds Jesus first highlights the differences between himself and his audience, then corrects the mistake they made in ignor-

¹³² There is also a substitution in Jesus’ (non-quotative) paraphrase: “where I am” (ὅπου εἰμι ἐγώ, 7:34) becomes “where I am going” (ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, 8:21). In both cases, the verb appears just before the important phrase (“*I am* with you a little while,” 7:33; “*I am going* and you will seek me,” 8:21), although ὑπάγω also appears in 7:34. Barrett (*John*, 325), following the Syriac suggests re-accenting εἰμι to εἶμι (“I am about to go”), but his suggestion has not found much scholarly support.

¹³³ On the irony in both of the Jews’ responses, see Duke, *Irony*, 85-86.

ing his substitution by reintroducing the statement himself that *they*, not he, will die in their sins.

It should be emphasized again, though, that subtractions are not only used to suggest limited or incorrect understanding, as can be demonstrated when Jesus quotes what he says here to a new audience: the disciples. At his last meal, just after Judas has left the group, Jesus tells the disciples (13:33): “Little children, I am with you yet a little while. You will seek me, and just as I said to the Jews, ‘*Where I am going you cannot come*,’ I now also say to you.” Jesus gives exactly the same extracted quote as the Jews did in 8:22, but he has not failed to understand himself or focused on the wrong matter. Instead, his audience has changed.¹³⁴ He begins by saying, “you will seek me,” but does not continue either with “and you will not find me” (7:34) or with “and you will die in your sins” (8:21) because his present audience, comprised exclusively of his more loyal disciples, *will* find him (in fact they will follow him where he goes, 13:36) and will not die in their sins but will have *eternal life*. Jesus subtracts the elements that are inappropriate given the new context even while recalling the former context where they were appropriate. To the extent that the disciples (or the audience) may recall the earlier scene, the omissions serve to contrast the disciples with the Jews.

One final example where Jesus quotes exactly a portion of a past statement demonstrates how the contexts of a statement, lexically identical in both quotations, can

¹³⁴ Brankaer (“Citations internes,” 141) rightly recognizes the change of audience as a factor, and she adds that it is no coincidence that Jesus repeats 8:21 (“where I *go*”) rather than 7:34 (“where I *am*”) since, while the disciples cannot go where he is going at least right now, Jesus does not want to indicate an ontological difference between he and the disciples (as she detects between Jesus and the Jews) and because Jesus’ absence is partially alleviated by the presence of the Paraclete (14:26).

influence how the statement is interpreted. After Jesus washes the disciples' feet and seems to interpret the act as a symbol of the full cleansing that will take place after his death (13:1-11), he asks the disciples (including Judas Iscariot) whether they know what he has done for them, (re)interpreting the footwashing ethically in terms of humility (13:12-20).¹³⁵ Jesus, as their teacher and master/Lord, has given them an example of the type of humility that they should show to each other. At the center of this call to humility, Jesus tells them (13:16): "Amen, amen, I say to you, *a slave is not greater than his master*, nor is the one who is sent greater than the one who sent him." While throughout the footwashing scene and its interpretation as an example of humility, the betrayal and crucifixion of Jesus are heavily foreshadowed, there is little indication of the persecution of the *disciples*. If anything, Jesus seems to warn them not to get too full of themselves or else an example of humility would not need to be provided.

Yet later on, after Judas Iscariot has left, the persecution of the disciples moves to the fore. Jesus tells them that the world will hate them because they do not belong to it (15:18-19) and then adds (15:20): "Remember the word that I said to you, 'A slave is not greater than his master'. If they persecuted me, they will also persecute you." The logion is no longer a call to humility, but an acknowledgement that the disciples will be persecuted just like their master so long as they continue to follow him and to imitate him. By repeating the statement, Jesus expands on its application and interpretation, including the

¹³⁵ Von Wahlde (*John*, 2:590-99) catalogues the tensions between the initial interpretation (13:7-10) and the subsequent ethical one (13:12-17), tracing the tensions to redactional layering. Moloney (*John*, 375) and Lincoln (*John*, 371) voice dissent to redactional solutions, while Cornelis Bennema ("Mimesis in John 13: Cloning or Creative Articulation?" *NovT* 56 [2014]: 261-74) gives a fuller explanation of how the two interpretations function together rhetorically. All acknowledge the shift in interpretation in 13:12.

disciples in his persecution. This reinterpretation does not replace the one given to it in chapter 13; the disciples are still expected to act humbly towards one another. In this sense a slave is not greater than his master. However, the disciples will suffer as Jesus suffers, and in this sense as well (and concurrently) the slave is not greater than his master. A lexical change in the subtracted phrase was not necessary; the different contexts alter how we interpret the saying.¹³⁶

Importantly, the impact of the context of speech on its interpretation is felt in John's only truly exact quotations. Arriving exhausted at a well in the midday sun, Jesus asks a Samaritan woman for a drink (δός μοι ποῖν, 4:7). These are the only three words he says to her. He and the woman are at a well; it is not unreasonable to assume that Jesus actually wants water. Yet after the woman reminds Jesus of the typical social (specifically, *halakhic*) barriers between them, Jesus himself calls attention to the unique context in which this request was made because of who made it and what *he* can give *her* (4:10): "If you knew the gift of God, and who it is who says to you, 'Give me a drink (δός μοι ποῖν),' you would have asked him and he would have given you living water." That is to say, she would have understood the request differently if she understood more about its present context. Jesus is probably still physically thirsty, but he invites the woman to look for a deeper significance in the statement by repeating it in the context of "living water."

¹³⁶ Although I have chosen to highlight the differences in the two contexts, they are significantly interlaced. The slave/master imagery is introduced as early as 15:15. After 15:20, Jesus complains that those who will persecute the disciples do not know the one who *sent* Jesus (15:21, τὸν πέμψαντά με; cf. τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν in 13:16 and τὸν πέμψαντά με in 13:20) but promises that he will *send* (πέμψω; cf. 13:20) the Paraclete to them. Slave imagery is not present after the quotation; sending imagery is not present before it. The similar transition from slave/master to sent/sender suggests that the reinterpretation of material from John 13 is more extensive than merely putting the one logion to a different use, and that a developed parallel has been worked out between Jesus and his disciples.

While the previous case was already short, the only other fully exact quotations consist of just two words. Jesus, knowing he is about to be arrested, asks the soldiers whom they are seeking; they answer, “Jesus the Nazorean” (18:3-5). Jesus identifies himself with the words ἐγώ εἰμι. Although elsewhere in John the words ἐγώ εἰμι have taken on a more significant aspect by invoking the divine name, here they only seem to mean, “I am he,” i.e. Jesus the Nazorean (cf. the blind man’s identical phrasing in 9:9). Yet the narrator re-quotes Jesus in the next verse to signify the effect that Jesus’ statement has (18:6): “When he said to them, ἐγώ εἰμι, they stepped back and fell to the ground.” Jesus’ utterance of the divine epithet (“I am”) seems, almost inadvertently, to have physically affected his audience. It can be distracting when a man whom one is about to arrest utters two words and knocks a crowd *including a Roman cohort* to the ground, so Jesus re-focuses them by asking again whom they are seeking. They answer again, “Jesus the Nazorean” (18:7). In his reply, Jesus quotes the previous speech act for a third time (18:8): “I told you, ‘I am he’.” No effect on the cohort is mentioned, and seemingly the brief phrase has reacquired its role of simple self-identification. Indeed without the contextual clue about the cohort falling to the ground and the larger literary clues provided by Jesus’ many predicated and absolute “I am” statements, we may never have suspected that it played any other role than identifying him with the name, “Jesus the Nazorean.” Still, in the context of Jesus saying these words, it has the force *both* of a self-identification *and* of the divine name.

Substitution in Greco-Roman and Jewish Contexts

Theon initially discusses paraphrase by substitution in simple terms, swapping out one word for another (*Prog.* 140), for example replacing δοῦλος with παῖς or ἀνδράποδον.¹³⁷ However, the definition of substitution is soon expanded to include a metaphorical word in place of the proper word (and vice versa),¹³⁸ several words for one word (and vice versa),¹³⁹ or even an alteration of the mood from interrogative to declarative and so forth. For students who have become accustomed to paraphrase, Theon modifies a contrastive statement from Demosthenes (18.119: “You admit that it is legal to accept gifts, yet you indict as illegal the acknowledgement of gifts”) in a more declarative formulation: “If you admit that it is legal to accept gifts, then you cannot say that the acknowledgement of gifts is illegal.”¹⁴⁰ Theon’s students, however, are discouraged from this mode unless the sense can be maintained because the message lends itself to a fortuitous paraphrase (*Prog.* 142).

In changing the type of statement made and making it more direct, we may compare Jesus’ self-paraphrase with Nicodemus. In what appears to be a non-sequitur, Jesus responds to Nicodemus’ complementary greeting by saying:

¹³⁷ One is reminded of the accounts of Jesus healing at a distance. In Luke 7:1-10 and Matt 8:5-13 δοῦλος and παῖς are alternately used for the centurion’s servant, while in John 4:46-53 the royal official’s son is referred to as υἱός, παιδίον, and παῖς. The use of synonyms in these cases seems to be for the sake of *variatio*.

¹³⁸ Although Theon does not provide any direct examples, Aphthonius does in his *Progymnasmata* (4.16-5.8) when he paraphrases a metaphorical saying by Isocrates (“The root of education is bitter, but its fruit sweet”) in more literal terms: “The lover of education begins with toil but toil which nevertheless ends in profit.” Text and translation in Hock and O’Neil, *Progymnasmata*, 224-27.

¹³⁹ This in part justifies my decision not to look merely at the length of the sentence in classifying paraphrases as subtractions or additions when changes in vocabulary are also present; see above.

¹⁴⁰ The phrasing is reconstructed under influence of the text of Demosthenes as we have it since the Armenian of Theon’s text is somewhat muddled here (see Patillon, *Progymnasmata*, 110 n. 570).

John 3:3: “Amen, amen, I say to you [sing.], unless someone is born from above (γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν), he cannot see the Kingdom of God.”

Nicodemus fails to understand what Jesus is talking about both here and in the paraphrase Jesus gives in 3:5 (“unless someone is born *of water and of spirit*, he cannot *enter* the Kingdom of God”). On his third try, Jesus alters the mood of his statement to clarify his meaning:

John 3:7: “You should not be amazed that I said, ‘You [pl.] must be born from above (γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν)’.”

Nicodemus seems to doubt even the possibility of being born again (cf. 3:4), and one may guess that he feels, as a representative figure of the Pharisees, rulers, and Jews (3:1) and teacher of Israel (3:10), that he has done all he has been asked to see the Kingdom of God. Yet it is precisely as a representative of these groups (hence the plural “you”) that Jesus assures him that he not only can but *must* be born again.¹⁴¹ While Jesus’ original

¹⁴¹ Carroll D. Osburn, “Some Exegetical Observations on John 3:5-8,” *Restoration Quarterly* 31 (1989): 129-38, here 135. On a more speculative note, very soon after Nicodemus’ next appearance (7:45-52), other Jews will assert that God is in some way their Father (8:41). Since the verb in 3:3, 7 ambiguously refers both to birth and to begetting, it is possible that—in John’s view—the Jews believe themselves to have been in some way begotten from above already. In this case, Nicodemus’ fault is that he identifies spiritual heritage with genetic or cultural heritage and so denies the possibility of changing one’s status in life, say, if one were born a Gentile. Jesus’s paraphrase, with its emphatically placed pronoun, would counter this notion by asserting that “*you* (too) must be born from above!” Interestingly, immediately before Nicodemus’ third appearance (19:38-42), parental imagery appears again when Jesus’ mother sees him on the cross and becomes the mother to the Beloved Disciple (19:25-27), presumably without the need for a physical re-birth, and Jesus will spill blood and water from his side which, whatever else it might mean, has been attached to birthing imagery (recently see Deborah Sawyer, “Water and Blood: Birthing Images in John’s Gospel,” in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer* [ed. W.G.E. Watson, J. Davies, and G. Harvey; JSOTSupp 195; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], 300-309, Barbara Reid, “Between Text & Sermon: John 7:37-39,” *Interpretation* 63/4 [2009]: 394-96, and Caroline W. Bynum, “The Body of Christ in the Later Middle Ages,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 39/3 [1986]: 399-439, who points to Medieval depictions of Jesus giving birth to the Church on the cross or feeding the Church from his wound [located at his breast], indicating that the association cannot be dis-missed as the product of modern feminist interpretation). Arguably the teacher and ruler of the Jews under-goes a curriculum on what it means to be truly begotten from above.

phrasing is quite general, his paraphrase applies directly to Nicodemus and the people he represents as an implicit criticism—one that will continue through the next few verses.¹⁴²

Making sense and keeping in the character of the present narrative voice serve as controls in substitutive paraphrase, evident in an example from Seneca the Elder. In the *Suasoriae* (1.12), Seneca's disputants list a series of imitations of the philosopher Fabianus, essentially all paraphrases of his lines on Ocean. Not all of them are successful, and Cestius' contribution reminds them of a *metaphrasis* of Homer given by Dorion which they consider to be "in worse taste than anything ever said since taste began to deteriorate."¹⁴³ This gives Seneca's characters the chance to comment on the difference between the extravagance and bombast of Dorion's paraphrase when compared to the restraint of Virgil. In describing the first attempt of Polyphemus to sink Odysseus' ship, Homer (*Odyssey* 9.481-83) gives the following sentence:

He hurled the top of a great mountain (ὄρεος) which he had broken off (ἀπορρήξας), and he cast it (ἔβαλε) down in front of the dark-prowed ship.

Dorion's paraphrase is brief by comparison:

He tears away a mountain (ὄρος ἀποσπᾶται) from a mountain, and in his hand he casts (βάλλεται) an island.

¹⁴² Four of Jesus' next five sentences are critical of "you" or "you all": "you" do not know where the wind comes from (3:8); "you" are a teacher of Israel yet do not know these things (3:10); "you all" do not receive our testimony (3:11); and if "you all" did not believe when Jesus told "you all" earthly things, how will "you all" believe if he tells "you all" heavenly things (3:12)? Aside from the typical "Amen, amen, I say to you" introductions to sayings, Jesus does not use second person pronouns or verbs before his paraphrase in 3:7.

¹⁴³ A somewhat loose translation of, *Corruptissimam rem omnium quae umquam dictae sunt, ex quo homines disertis insanire coeperunt*, taken from William A. Edward, ed. and trans., *Seneca the Elder: Suasoriae* (Newburyport: Bristol Classical Press, 1996), 44.

In the *Suasoriae*, Maecenas judges this to be inflated and impossible. Meanwhile Virgil's claim that Polyphemus grabs "no small part of the mountain" gives an impression of the size of the rock without violating credibility (*non imprudenter discedat a fide*); after the rock is cast, "one might think (*credas*) that the Cyclades were torn up and swimming on the sea"; the addition of "one might think" is said to allow for Virgil's more indulgent imagery.¹⁴⁴ Dorion has adopted some of Homer's language,¹⁴⁵ and his critics challenge neither the changes in specific vocabulary (e.g. "broke off" versus "tore away") nor the abridgement of the sentence. Instead Dorion's paraphrase is judged poorly by its *content*, that is, in terms of the quality of the image that he creates: Dorion has Polyphemus do the impossible by tearing up an entire mountain and (in an inconsistent string of images) throwing a whole island, while Virgil's paraphrase is praised for remaining grounded in established narrative reality.¹⁴⁶

As far as reasons for paraphrasing in this manner, Theon claims essentially two objectives (*Prog.* 141). The first goal is to become accustomed to writing in the style of great writers, first through exact replication and then through modifying their texts while keeping in character. At a more advanced stage, a student may be asked to paraphrase

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Virgil, *Aeneid* 8.691-92 and 10.128. See n. 20 above.

¹⁴⁵ The two descriptions share ὄρος and βάλλω, and Homer's use of ἀπορρήγνυμι at least shares a prefix with Dorion's ἀποσπάω. Euripides, *Cyclops* 704 borrows Homer's verb directly, and the next line incorporates βάλλω, but he avoids "mountain" altogether, opting simply for "rock" (πέτρα). One might even wonder whether Dorion's νῆσος ('island') was phonetically linked to Homer's νεὸς ('ship') since the former ignores the ship, but Virgil's use of the image of the Cyclades for the rock suggests that Polyphemus tossing islands had become a trope.

¹⁴⁶ It perhaps should be noted that while Dorion's paraphrase is in the same language as Homer, Virgil "paraphrases" in Latin (at least as the disputants view it). Again, this does not seem to be problematic for the characters in the *Suasoriae*, so long as 1) the paraphrase is eloquently stated in Latin, and 2) the sense of the paraphrase approaches or even surpasses Homer.

Lysias, for example, in the manner of Demosthenes and vice versa. The second goal goes along with the recognition that the great writers are not always perfect, and so the student should look for opportunities to improve upon them and make the texts clearer and more expressive.¹⁴⁷

Substitutive paraphrase occurs in many cases in the Hebrew texts surveyed by Savran. These can be small changes (lexically at least), as in the case when Jacob's sons say that they were told to "leave" Benjamin with Joseph (Gen 42:33). In fact they were told to let Benjamin "be bound in prison" (Gen 42:19). Apparently the sons want to downplay the gravity of the situation to their disapproving father. Savran also gives an example where Isaac paraphrases himself in order to shift the perspective of his original statement, again in the service of tact. In Gen 26:7 Isaac asks his wife to say that she is his sister because, he thinks, otherwise the men of Gerar "might kill me because of Rebekah, because she is very beautiful."¹⁴⁸ When Abimelech catches him fondling his wife, however, and asks why he said that she was his sister, Isaac claims, "Because I said,

¹⁴⁷ Cicero (*De or.* 1.54-55) presents Lucius Crassus (d. 91 BCE) as arguing against the substitutive paraphrase of verses and speeches—although he admits to having earlier practiced it in imitation of others before him—because the most fitting words had already been chosen by the great orators. If he used the same words he gained nothing; and if he used different words he only trained himself to speak poorly. Instead he took to translating Greek speeches into Latin. Quintilian directly counters Cicero's position on paraphrase, arguing that we should vie with our predecessors as rivals (*Inst. Or.* 10.5.5-7). Outside of Quintilian substitutive paraphrase is advocated in order to introduce or improve meter in poetry (although it is late, see Maurus Servius Honoratus [5th century CE], *Commentary on Virgil's Georgics* 164), and presumably it could be used to clarify a line when translating poetry into prose (when the concern for meter no longer limits choices in wording). However, this use of substitution has little bearing on John who is paraphrasing prose in prose.

¹⁴⁸ The construction here is somewhat awkward. The narrator seemingly quotes Isaac's *fears* directly: "He said, 'She is my sister,' for *he* feared to say, 'She is *my* wife' lest the men of the place kill *me* (יהרגני) because of Rebekah." The first person singular continues throughout even after the statement that he fears to say ("She is my wife") is past. The problem is corrected in the LXX where the fears are rendered indirect (ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν).

‘Lest I die because of her’” (Gen 26:9). The sense is the same in both statements, but Isaac has wisely eliminated the agents of homicide since he is now talking with their leader. He has extracted the problematic point from his original statement (11 words versus three in quotation),¹⁴⁹ shifting the focus from their potential actions (killing Isaac) to his own potential experience (being killed).

Substitution in the Gospel of John

Similarly in the Gospel of John, points of dispute taken from much longer arguments are extracted and paraphrased in a few brief words. Above I noted how Jesus’ long (four clause) statement on how true discipleship is liberating (8:31-32; in all, 22 words) is summarized by the Jews with just two Greek words: “You will become free people” (ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε, 8:33). The abridgements are significant, as is the paraphrase of the verb which allows them to drop the cause of their freedom, i.e. the truth. We see similar moves elsewhere, always in hostile situations. After Jesus declares that he has come so that the blind might see and those who see may become blind (9:39), some of the Pharisees ask, “We are not also blind, are we?” (9:40; five words). In his reply, Jesus summarizes their position (and, one guesses, accurately so) with one word, “We see” (βλέπομεν, 9:41) before telling them that their sin remains. A double case occurs in another tense scene as the Jews are attempting to stone Jesus, as they say, “not for good works... but *for blasphemy* (περὶ βλασφημίας), and because you, being human, make yourself God”

¹⁴⁹ If we compare the indirect quote in LXX Gen 26:7 to the direct quote in 26:9, the imbalance is maintained: 14 words (μήποτε ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου περὶ Ρεβέκκας ὅτι ὥραία τῇ ὄψει ἦν) versus four (μήποτε ἀποθάνω δι’ αὐτήν).

(10:33; in all, 17 words). Soon Jesus paraphrastically summarizes both their position and his own:

John 10:35-36: “If he called them gods, to whom the word of God came, and Scripture cannot be broken, do you tell the one whom God has sanctified and sent into the world, ‘You blaspheme’ (βλασφημεῖς) because I said, ‘I am God’s Son’ (υἱὸς θεοῦ εἰμι)?”

Again, Jesus accurately summarizes his opponents’ position in one word. Jesus also summarizes his own message in language that he has not used exactly so far. He has spoken of God as his Father and of himself as the Son, and he has claimed to *be* many things using the phrase, “I am.”¹⁵⁰ But he has never actually said, “I am God’s Son.” The phrasing of the quotation is not precisely like John’s Jesus: there is no ἐγώ and both “Son” and “God” have no article, making it even a somewhat uncharacteristic paraphrase of himself.¹⁵¹

Yet this summary of his message (in three words) fits within his present argument. First, “god” has appeared without an article in both the charge by the Jews (10:33) and in Jesus’ citation of Psalm 82:6 (in John 10:34). The line of the psalm continues,

¹⁵⁰ The references to God as Father are quite numerous, but within this short conversation alone he has already done so five times (10:25, 29 [2x], 30, 32) and will do so another four (10:36, 27, 38 [2x]). He has not referred to himself as Son here, but has done so quite often in past conflicts with the Jews (see 8:35, 36 in the Tabernacles scene or the nine cases in chapter 5).

¹⁵¹ Although Jesus is reluctant to directly claim, “I am the Son of God,” others in the gospel are actually quite prone to do so for him with a similar construction, either in the second person (“You are the Son of God,” 1:49; 11:27) or in the third person (“He/Jesus is the Son of God,” 1:34; 20:31). “The unique Son of God” is mentioned in 3:18, although it is unclear whether Jesus or the narrator is speaking here (see Lincoln, *John*, 147 for discussion). Jesus also claims that the hour is coming when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God (5:25), and it is clear from the context that he intends an identification with himself. All of these carry an article both for Son and for God.

“You are gods, you are all sons of the Most High.”¹⁵² Assuming his audience knows the psalm, then on one level Jesus’ argument claims that—minimally—he has the status of this *class* of being. One might hear his summary as, “I am *a son* of God” (read: either judge or member of Israel, given the applications of this psalm that are evident elsewhere)¹⁵³—something less offensive in context and more appropriate to counter their argument.

This conclusion is supported by the last example of broad summarizing phrase. After Jesus is convicted Pilate has the *titulus* written, “Jesus the Nazorean, the King of the Jews” (19:19). The chief priests of the Jews complain to the Roman (19:21): “Do not write, ‘The King of the Jews,’ but that he said, ‘I am the Jews’ king’ (βασιλεύς εἰμι τῶν Ἰουδαίων).”¹⁵⁴ Although Theobald points to 18:37 as a precedent for the

¹⁵² See Brown, *John*, 1:409: “Jesus is interested not only in the use of the term ‘gods’ but also in the synonymous expression ‘sons of the Most High,’ for he refers to himself as Son of God in vs. 36.”

¹⁵³ According to Keener (*John*, 1:828-29), the texts supporting the “judge” interpretation are quite late (beginning with Rashi in the 11th century), but those supporting the interpretation of Israel as the gods at least begin to appear earlier and more often (see *Sipre Deut.* 306.28.2; *Lev. Rab.* 4:1; *Num. Rab.* 16:24; *Pesiq. Rab.* 1:2; 14:10). There may be another nuance: the Jews may view Jesus as a second Antiochus Epiphanes, an enemy of the temple who claims divine status, which is why they may be more sensitive to his presence in the temple during the Feast of Dedication. The phrasing also allows the understanding, “I am *a son of a god*,” as Antiochus claimed. The statement fits Colwell’s construction (definite predicate nominative that is nonetheless anarthrous and pre-verbal; see Daniel B. Wallace, *The Basics of New Testament Syntax* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000], 115, 119), but even with this construction one can only take the predicate as definite *if the context demands it* (as with the anarthrous “king of Israel” in John 1:49). Jesus’ followers would argue that Jesus is the unique Son of the unique God, and so the context demands “*the Son of the God*.” This is far less certain with an audience of hostile Jews in the Fourth Gospel. Such an understanding would align with a third human interpretation of the gods of Psalm 82, that they are the rulers of the nations. The polyvalency of Jesus’ phrasing may serve the differences in perception: the disciple of Jesus hears “the (unique) Son of God” while the disbeliever hears “[a] son of [a] god,” something less savory in a monotheistic setting where the divine claims of Greek and then Roman emperors historically accompanied subjugation and persecution. This, however, would not be the use to which Jesus puts it in his argument at the story level.

¹⁵⁴ On different ways of translating and punctuating this sentence, see the Appendix.

quotation,¹⁵⁵ Jesus does not claim to be the king there, but instead *he* indirectly quotes *Pilate*: “You say that I am king.”¹⁵⁶ The two scenes are connected—after all Pilate uses the *titulus* to declare Jesus as the king¹⁵⁷—but none of Jesus’ “I am” statements involves kingship. The quotation seems instead to be a paraphrase summary of his actions (especially the triumphal entry, 12:12-19) and of his positions.¹⁵⁸ Although the presence or absence of an article can carry a broad range of meanings and nuances, it may have to do with John’s emphasis on Jesus’ uniqueness: he is not *a* king of the Jews, he is *the* King of the Jews; he is not *a* son of God, he is *the* unique Son of God. Eliminating the article in these quotations could signify that the Jews fail to understand Jesus’ uniqueness.¹⁵⁹

In all of the cases mentioned so far, the paraphrases are basically if only partially accurate. Disciples will become free (only because the truth will free them), and Jesus is

¹⁵⁵ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 36-37; he does so, however, without comment.

¹⁵⁶ To be fair, Pilate has asked Jesus if he is *the* King of the Jews (18:33), and Jesus indirectly quotes him without an article (βασιλεύς εἰμι) as it is phrased here. Although it would not be the only time that something Jesus said in privacy is quoted later in public (cf. 12:34 and 3:14), the Jews are specifically excluded from the conversation with Pilate because they want to avoid pollution before the Passover (cf. 18:28).

¹⁵⁷ Some view Pilate’s affirmations of Jesus’ kingship positively (as seems to be the case in Brown, *John*, 2:918-20), but it seems more likely that Pilate uses it to antagonize the Jews (see Duke, *Irony*, 89 and David Rensberger, “The Politics of John: The Trial of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel,” *JBL* 103/3 [1984]: 395-411, here 402), at least at the story level.

¹⁵⁸ Some of the chief priests may have heard (at the story level) about the attempts by the people to make him king as well (cf. 6:15). The scene with Pilate in 18:33-38 may be helpful in this sense: Pilate asks Jesus if he is the King of the Jews and Jesus wonders whether he says this on his own or if others suggested it to him. Jesus then speaks casually about his kingdom. If rumors are going around that Jesus is acting in a way that suggests a run for the crown, especially if Jesus has been speaking about a kingdom (cf. mentions of the Kingdom of God with Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, in 3:3, 5), then their quotation essentially summarizes these rumors while assigning them to Jesus himself.

¹⁵⁹ It is important not to push this point too far. The Son of Man is mentioned 12 times in John, and in 11 out of 12 both “Son” and “Man” carry an article (1:51; 3:13, 14; 6:27, 53, 62; 8:28; 9:35; 12:23, 34; 13:31). In just one case, however, both nouns are anarthrous (5:27) with little indication that a difference in meaning (such as “*a* son of man”) is intended.

God's Son and King of the Jews, even if he might add that he is the unique Son of God whose kingdom is not of this world and so not limited to the Jews. These summarizing paraphrases are used hostilely in tense scenes, and one fault that Seneca's disputants might find with the paraphrases is that they are too broad and ignore important specifics about Christ, his sonship and his kingdom, in the context of the narrative.

That is not the case when the Jews substitute "taste death" for Jesus' "see death" (8:51-52). Both expressions are euphemisms for dying, simply and physically; the modification of the verb alone is incapable of changing the sense of the whole phrase. Instead, the change helps to tip off the audience that a concurrent change in interpretation has happened. Since the phrasing is so similar in many ways, how else is this imbalance in understanding signaled in the text? First, the context of their greater argument demands it: the quotation is presented as a contradiction of the simple fact that Abraham and the prophets physically died. If Jesus could ward off physical death through his word, then presumably he could prevent himself from dying, making him greater than Abraham. Their attempt to stone him moments later suggests they suspect that he *can* in fact die and so the claim that his word prevents physical death (as they understand it) is false. Second, we examined above how the shifts in grammar and syntax that they impose on the sentence keep the focus on the elements of their disbelief: How can Jesus' *word* ensure that a believer *will never taste* death? Although the shifts in grammar and in expression (seeing death versus tasting it) are negligible taken one by one, taken together in context they produce, like Dorio above, a poor paraphrase. Jesus' statement has become bombastic and incredible. He may not have signaled the fatal end of his mission very clearly thus far

(ambiguous “lifting up” statements like 8:28 notwithstanding), but Jesus has never indicated that he will never physically die. In fact, aside from the numerous hints about his death that an informed reader would pick up on, the implied reader has been told explicitly that Jesus will have to be raised *from the dead* (see 2:21-22)!

Another function of substitutive paraphrase may be to shift the perspective of the statement, as was the case in an example above where Isaac rephrases “they might kill me” with “lest I die.”¹⁶⁰ The end result is the same, although in one case the focus is on the men doing the killing and in the other it is on the man being killed. In the case of Isaac it seems that tact was a major factor, but it does not always have to be. One troublesome quotation in the Fourth Gospel comes when Jesus tells the disciples who are about to leave him:

John 6:65: “For this reason I have told you, ‘No one can come to me unless it is given to him by the Father’ (οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με εἰ μὴ ἡ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πατρός).”

Two previous verses repeatedly come up as precedents for Jesus’ quotation:

John 6:37: “Everything that the Father gives me will come to me (πάν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατήρ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἔξει).”

John 6:44: “No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him (οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρὸς με εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ ὁ πέμψας με ἐλκύσῃ αὐτόν).”

¹⁶⁰ For a non-biblical example, see Plato, *Apology* 29c, d. In the first case Socrates says, “If I were acquitted (εἰ διαφευξοίμην),” but moments later quotes himself as saying, “If you acquit me (εἰ οὖν με... ἀφίετε) on these terms...” The first statement prefaces an argument that, if he is free, he will only keep “corrupting the youth” through his teaching. The second exhorts the jury instead not to believe that a compromise is possible in which Socrates stops teaching and practicing philosophy: if you acquit me on these terms, you will find yourself questioned by me on the street sooner or later.

Several commentators argue for a mixture of both verses,¹⁶¹ while others appeal to the latter verse only.¹⁶² The appeal of 6:37 seems to lie in its use of the same verb for “to give,” but this is at best a very loose borrowing: in one verse something is given to Jesus, in the other presumably something else is given to the one coming to Jesus. Instead, viewing 6:65 as a reference to 6:44 is perfectly within the bounds of paraphrase. Indeed the two statements start off identically (“No one can come to me unless...”); only the second clause differs. In the first case Jesus describes the event from the Father’s point of view: the Father will draw the believer in. In the paraphrase, Jesus describes the event from the believer’s point of view: the call has been given to him by the Father.¹⁶³

If the precise reasons for shifting the perspective of the statement are not entirely clear, we can say at least that the shift correlates with a dramatic change in the purpose that the statement is made to serve. That is, in the first instance it serves a positive argument: no one can come to Jesus unless the Father calls him, but once the Father does,

¹⁶¹ Brown, *John*, 1:297; Lincoln, *John*, 238; Noack (*Tradition*, 144) acknowledges 6:37, but recognizes that 6:44 is closer.

¹⁶² B.F. Westcott uniquely connects 6:65 to 6:37 alone (*The Gospel According to St. John* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964], 110). Most connect 6:65 at least partially if not exclusively to 6:44, e.g. Keener, *John*, 1:695.

¹⁶³ I refer to “the call” as the gift of the Father tentatively. It is unclear what precisely is intended as the subject of the neuter participle, but if it were specifically a call (κλησις) in view then we might expect a feminine participle instead. However the same construction is used twice elsewhere in John, once at 3:27, “no one can receive anything (οὐδὲ ἓν in the neuter) unless it is given (ἢ δεδομένον),” and again at 19:11, “You would have no authority (ἐξουσίαν) against me whatsoever unless it was given (ἢν δεδομένον).” In the latter case, a neuter participle describes a feminine noun (“authority,” strengthened by the feminine οὐδεμίαν) that is given to Pilate from above. Perhaps there is an ellipsis and τι or another subject should be provided, but 19:11 suggests that John does not require a strict match in gender when using this construction, leaving the subject of “it is given” open. If a neuter noun is insisted upon in 6:65, ἐρχόμενον (“coming”) or even πνεῦμα might fit nicely. The position of Karl O. Sandnes that 6:65 is “a slightly altered quotation” of 3:27, *spoken by the Baptist*, is considerably problematic even if we may more probably say that they reflect similar traditions (“Whence and Whither: A Narrative Perspective on Birth ἀνωθεν [John 3,3-8],” *Biblica* 86/2 [2005]: 153-73).

that person will be raised on the last day, will learn from God, and will have eternal life (6:44-47). It makes sense that weight should be placed on the positive dimension: the irresistible call of the Father. Meanwhile, more weight is placed on the negative aspects of the statement in the later context, where Jesus has told some of his disciples that they do not believe, something he has known from the beginning along with the fact that one of his disciples will hand him over (6:64). For these reasons he has told his disciples that no one may come to him unless it is given by the Father. Apparently, for Judas Iscariot and the disciples who are about to leave him, it has not.

One final role of substitutive paraphrase is to clarify or specify the meaning of a statement. In chapter 4 we will examine the progression of 1:27/1:30/1:15 in this light, but here a simpler example will do. The formal conviction of Jesus takes place early and behind the scenes in John, after the resuscitation of Lazarus (see 11:45-53). In this context, Caiaphas declares to the Sanhedrin (11:50): “You do not consider that it is profitable to you that one man should die for the people and that the whole nation should not perish (συνφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται).” His reasoning is quite clear: popular belief in Jesus is creating a threat from the Romans to the temple and to the nation (τὸ ἔθνος), so it is better if he is eliminated. However, the narrator modifies Caiaphas’ meaning along with his words when he comments on the statement:

John 11:51-52: But he did not say this from himself, but being High Priest that year, he prophesied, “Jesus was about to die for the nation (ἔμελλεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπο-

θνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους),” and not only for the nation but so that the children of God who have been scattered may also gather as one.¹⁶⁴

Much has been made of the substitution of “nation” for Caiaphas’ “people,”¹⁶⁵ especially since, when the phrase is quoted a second time by the narrator, “people” is reinstated:

John 18:14: Caiaphas was the one who advised the Jews, “It is profitable for one man to die for the people (συμφέρει ἓνα ἄνθρωπον ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ).”

Origen applies “people” to the Jews and “nation” to the Gentiles, others “people” to the theocratic body and “nation” to the civic body of the Jews, while Severino Pancaro’s solution is that Caiaphas uses “people” with the traditional, septuagintal connotation of Israel while “nation” is used by the narrator in reference to the Jews because the followers of Jesus have become the new “people” of God.¹⁶⁶ Hence Jesus will die “not only for the nation” (i.e. Jewish believers) but so that *all* the dispersed children of God may be gathered. Allowing that some of these connotations are active in the paraphrase(s), “people” and “nation” are placed in apposition in Caiaphas’ original statement; they are treated as synonyms like seeing and tasting death. The alternation between them signals the differing perspectives of the character (Caiaphas or the narrator) making the argument.

¹⁶⁴ It is unclear whether 11:52 should be considered a parenthetical explanation of the paraphrase (just so we’re clear, *not only* for the Jewish nation) or as an addition, and thus included in the quotation marks. I take it as the former. Noack (*Tradition*, 135-36) argues that the ὅτι is causal in 11:51: “he prophesied *because* Jesus was about to die...” Given the unusual phrasing, it is difficult to refute Noack conclusively.

¹⁶⁵ Although “nation” is already present in Caiaphas’ statement—it is simply moved forward into the slot originally filled by “people.” For a survey of various positions, see Severino Pancaro, “‘People of God’ in St John’s Gospel,” *NTS* 16/2 (1970): 114-29. In addition to the nuances listed below, according to Pancaro the two words have been viewed as pure synonyms (Barrett and Bultmann), the “people” as referring to Jews and “nation” inclusively to all people (Lightfoot), and this is not even to enter into the debate of how the “children of God” fits together with the two terms.

¹⁶⁶ Pancaro, “People of God,” 115, 121. Pancaro is followed more or less by Duke (*Irony*, 88), Lincoln (*John*, 330-31), and Keener (*John*, 2:857).

These perspectives are evident, at least in part, in two other modifications in John 11:51. First, Jesus is specified as the “one man” of the prophecy. Indeed, many scriptural prophecies regarding figures whose identities were unclear at best in their original context are applied specifically to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel in a similar fashion. John’s application of a Suffering Servant oracle (cf. Isa. 53:1) to Jesus soon after this scene in John 12:38 is a case in point.¹⁶⁷ Second, that it is “profitable to you” that Jesus should die is dropped entirely in the first DIQ. Given their unbelief, perhaps Jesus’ death is not profitable to *them* specifically at a salvific level. More to the point, the narrator is not concerned with the political reasoning of one High Priest but with the christological truth that Jesus died on behalf of others. In the story setting Jesus is going to do so quite soon: the general, almost gnomic, “it is profitable that one man should die for the people” is made into a direct claim: “*Jesus (specifically) is about to die (within the week) for the nation.*” From a purely rhetorical standpoint, the narrator’s paraphrase is actually a poor one since it goes well beyond Caiaphas’ intentions in making the statement. However, from a theological standpoint, the appeal to *unintentional* prophecy reverses the fault, making it so that Caiaphas poorly paraphrases what God intended in bringing him to speak like this. The narrator’s paraphrase more accurately draws out the meaning of the actual if unseen speaker, namely God. In the second DIQ of 11:50, where the narrator simply wants to

¹⁶⁷ Likewise, Jesus’ citation, “They hated me without cause” (15:25) seems to be from either Ps 35:19 or 69:4. Although both psalms are labelled “of David,” the figure in these psalms is anonymous and only characterized in very general terms, so that this and other citations of Psalm 69 (cf. John 2:17; 19:28) specify an originally general suffering figure as Jesus. Compare also the general oracle from Zech 12:10 cited at Jesus’ crucifixion (John 19:37). Interestingly in this last case—and anticipating a later discussion of Johannine eschatology—most early Christian allusions and citations of Zech 12:10 (Rev 1:7; *Barn.* 7:9; and Justin, *Ap.* 1.52.10-12; *Dial.* 64.7; 118.1) apply the seeing of the one they pierced to the *parousia* rather than to the crucifixion (see Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 168-70). Apparently only John applies its fulfilment explicitly within Jesus’ earthly mission.

remind the reader who Caiaphas is (18:14), much of the High Priest's language is reinstated since the reference is to him and not to the prophetic nature of his speech. Furthermore, since Jesus has just been arrested it is clear to the audience who is going to die and when.¹⁶⁸

Conclusion

The changes John makes to statements when they are quoted are not haphazard or purely stylistic. They are all well within the bounds of a school exercise that the author or authors most likely learned as young students. If the Jewish or Jewish-influenced authors needed any scriptural warrant in using DIQ in this manner, the Old Testament narratives paraphrase through DIQ in a very similar manner to the Fourth Gospel. Looking at the complicated and drawn out paraphrases of Simonides in Plato or of Homer in the anonymous school-hand papyrus, those in John are rather simple by comparison. At the other extreme, by looking at how these mild alterations modify the sense of the statement, sometimes slightly, sometimes wildly, and in ways that the speakers would agree with, we can also see that dismissing them as variety for variety's sake likewise misses important observations about what is going on in these verses. John does have some preferred variations, particularly with word order, but it will only use them when they are fortuitous and do not interfere with characterization. Otherwise John is quite capable of quoting exactly, if often only partially.

Taken together, a pattern emerges where the changes in wording align with the changes in emphasis or meaning that are important to the speakers. Attending to these

¹⁶⁸ This would be a narrative explanation. See von Wahlde, *John*, 2:522-24, 759 for a redaction-critical one.

changes can tell us something about the characters and about how they seek to influence the course of the arguments they are making in the Fourth Gospel. This will be the subject of the next chapter, which will focus on larger goals of thematic development and characterization. We have not yet had the opportunity to examine all of the ways that John uses paraphrase, especially substitutive paraphrase, to alter or to expose the meaning of statements.¹⁶⁹ In particular, in the final chapter we will focus on how the temporal reference of various statements is shifted between present and future. Yet we will see that those cases all follow the parameters for paraphrase established in this chapter, so that the question is not *whether* John modifies certain statements to shift their temporal framework purposefully or responsibly, but *why* it does so.

One final note should be added. The paraphrases in John's DIQ often follow an inclusive, "both/and" hermeneutic. That is to say, when a statement is reinterpreted, the reinterpretation does not replace the initial sense of the statement but adds to it. Some examples have already been pointed out: Jesus' use of "I am" in response to the Roman cohort (John 18:5-8) is *both* a prosaic acknowledgement that he is Jesus the Nazorean *and* (when used by him) an invocation of the divine name; Jesus' citation of the aphorism that a slave is not greater than his master (13:16; 15:20) is *both* a call to humility *and* an inclusion of the disciples in his persecution. Conversely, misunderstandings often arise when Jesus' audience attempts to reduce what he says to only one meaning: Jesus does mean that the Son of Man must die, as the crowds rightly infer (12:34), but he also means

¹⁶⁹ Nor have we yet been able to explore John's unverifiable quotations since the focus of this chapter was on alterations made to previous statements. By definition, previous statements are not provided for unverifiable quotations. We will examine this phenomenon further in the next chapter.

that the Son of Man must be exalted; people must in fact be born again (3:3), but ignoring the concurrent indication that this is accomplished only by being born through divine initiative, i.e. by being born from above, leads to Nicodemus mistaking birth ἄνωθεν for an impossibility. In this case, Jesus uses DIQ (3:7) to correct the ruler's mistake and to re-broaden the application of the original statement so that its spiritual dimension is underlined. The inclusive aspect of DIQ in reinterpreting past statements will become important when we turn our focus to Jesus' many statements regarding his departure(s) and return(s). It is also important in regard to the frequent application of DIQ to statements ascribed to Jesus and which appear to be traditional: John rarely denies the more traditional interpretation—in fact, DIQ allows the Fourth Gospel to give voice to it—but DIQ also provides a means to expand on the statement's application and meaning.

CHAPTER 3

THE ROLES OF DIQ IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

εἰ μὲν τοίνυν ἡγωνιζόμεν ὥς περὶ πράξεις τινὰ ἡμαρτηκώς, οὐκ ἂν οἶός τ' ἦν ἰδεῖν ὑμῖν αὐτὰς παρασχεῖν ἀλλ' ἀναγκαίως εἶχεν εἰκάζοντας ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων διαγιγνώσκειν ὅπως ἐτύχετε περὶ τῶν πεπραγμένων· ἐπειδὴ δὲ περὶ τοὺς λόγους ἔχω τὴν αἰτίαν, οἶμαι μᾶλλον ὑμῖν ἐμφανιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

If I were being tried for certain evil deeds, then I would not have been able to produce such things for you to see, but you would necessarily have representations to distinguish from what has been said, however you arrived concerning what has been done. But since I am charged concerning words, I think I will be in a better position to show you the truth.

Isocrates, *Antidosis* 53-54

The role that paraphrase plays in each individual case of DIQ was the focus of the last chapter, but here we will examine instead the roles of direct internal quotation in the broader context of the entire gospel. Each case of verifiable DIQ gives a sort of repetition: the narrator presents a statement made by one of the characters, and either represents the statement himself, or has a character within the story re-present the statement. Given the variance in the degree of paraphrase, some of these repetitions are stronger than others. This makes DIQ a highly redundant feature. Certainly the redundancy is felt by the 20th century scholars who complain of how tedious and inartistic the device is.¹ Yet repetition and the redundancies it imposes are frequent in biblical literature, certainly

¹ See above, chapter 1 n. 24.

so in John, as multiple studies have noted in the last few decades.² So DIQ may serve broader purposes *through* its redundancy rather than in spite of it. In this chapter we will examine DIQ as a redundant device to determine what John is doing with the device generally. The repetitions, with regard to content, allow John to refine how the readers understand certain sayings, eliminating some interpretations from consideration while strengthening or even introducing others. The repetitions of the device itself communicate additional information, especially in terms of characterization. However, much of this could be done without using direct internal quotations specifically, so the second part of this chapter will examine the particular literary motivations to use DIQ. Ultimately the ongoing trial motif in John, in which DIQ is presented either as testimony or used to question the testimony of others, serves as the largest single factor for John's use of direct internal quotation.

Part I: Direct Internal Quotation and Functional Redundancy in John

Most of the earlier scholars who commented on DIQ in the Fourth Gospel did so in the context of John's proclivity for repetition.³ The fact that so many of John's internal quotations are verifiable contributes to this, although it does not help to explain the several unverifiable or highly paraphrased quotations. These we will have to treat as citations

² Outside of John, see Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 88-113; Eugene A. Nida, *Style and Discourse: With Special Reference to the Text of the Greek New Testament* (Cape Town: BSSA, 1983), 22-33; Sternberg, *Poetics*, 365-440; Robert W. Funk, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988), 156-61, 204-6. On John, in addition to the works surveyed in chapter 1, see especially the work of Thomas Popp, *Grammatik des Geistes: Literarische Kunst und theologische Konzeption in Johannes 3 und 6* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2001) and "Die Kunst der Wiederholung: Repetition, Variation und Amplifikation im vierten Evangelium am Beispiel von Joh 6,60-71," in *Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive* (ed. J. Frey and U. Schnelle; WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 559-92 and the essays in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel*.

³ Recall that Schulze, Wilke, Stange, Bromboszcz, Abbott, Glasson, and Chang all study DIQ as a category of repetition.

below. Yet the earlier discussions rightly highlight how repetitive and therefore how *redundant* the device is. Recent studies on redundancy in (biblical) storytelling have argued that redundant repetition itself can help to transmit information.

In a foundational study of literary redundancy, Susan Suleiman examines its role in producing realistic and *readable* texts.⁴ “Readable” here is defined as a text that is intended as serious, structured, and authoritarian, “written in the realistic mode and seeking to persuade its readers of the validity or of the falsehood of a particular doctrine.”⁵ In contrast to the general impression that redundancy in literature is excessive or superfluous, that it implies a text “is full of things that it could, and should, have done without,” Suleiman uses a linguistic model of redundancy as her jumping off point.⁶ In language repetition is quite useful in eliminating “noise” in the transmission of information so that “plural meanings and ambiguities are eliminated and a single ‘correct’ reading [is] imposed.”⁷ In a contemporary context, think of the repetition of orders relayed from a commanding officer to a subordinate or from a surgeon to her team, where repetition reduces the chances of a miscommunication by confirming the intended message.

In literature repetition helps to establish the reliability of the narrator and of other characters as their interpretations are repeatedly confirmed. In John this is achieved by

⁴ “Redundancy and the ‘Readable’ Text,” *Poetics Today* 1/3 (1980): 119-42.

⁵ Suleiman, “Redundancy,” 119-20; the specific object of Suleiman’s study is the modern *roman à thèse*, but she first creates a general typology of redundancies used in readable texts which she then applies to her chosen genre.

⁶ Suleiman, “Redundancy,” 120. Think of the repetitions of a first draft that are refined and eliminated as it is edited.

⁷ Suleiman, “Redundancy,” 120.

continually aligning the perspectives of the narrator and of Jesus.⁸ It is also achieved by repeatedly showing the narrator and Jesus give reliable quotations, while others repeatedly *fail* to give adequate paraphrases of statements made by Jesus, misunderstandings that must be corrected. This is especially the case when the Jews quote Jesus exactly if only partially: apparently within the range of meanings one might get out of “where I am (going), you cannot come” (cf. John 7:34; 8:21), are the implications that Jesus is either leaving the country or is going to kill himself (cf. 7:35; 8:22). John eliminates these interpretations from consideration by having the already unreliable Jews (see 5:11; 6:41-42) give voice to them and having Jesus correct them in his teaching.

It was not long before Suleiman’s observations were picked up by Meir Sternberg and applied to repetition in the Old Testament narratives.⁹ Sternberg incorporates Suleiman’s model, in which “informational redundancy” helps to eliminate noise, i.e. lowers the probability of alternative readings, but he rightly notes the differences between purely verbal communications and literary discourse. The latter allows the rigorous selection and arrangement of materials by authors, and the return to and reexamination of texts by readers. Repetition can increase the predictability of the discourse so that the reader begins to anticipate certain phrases and forms (e.g. genealogies, law codes,

⁸ See Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 34-43, esp. 36: “Both Jesus and the narrator are omniscient, retrospective, and ideologically and phraseologically indistinguishable.”

⁹ *Poetics*, 365-440. Ronald D. Witherup developed Sternberg’s model in a pair of articles on Acts in which he replaces “informational redundancy” with “functional redundancy” since “even in Sternberg’s own description the purpose of such repetition is not simply to impart information” (“Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles: A Case Study,” *JSNT* 48 [1992]: 67-86, here 68 n. 4; see also “Cornelius Over and Over and Over Again: ‘Functional Redundancy’ in the Acts of the Apostles,” *JSNT* 49 [1993]: 45-66). Both Sternberg and Witherup choose their terminology to emphasize the positive roles that redundancy can play, rather than being only a stylistic defect. Soon after, Janice C. Anderson applied the model to the Gospel of Matthew (*Matthew’s Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again* [JSNTSup 91; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994], esp. 38-43).

etc.).¹⁰ However, Sternberg also highlights how repetition can be used to draw attention to deviations:

Take the striking frequency and diversity of the Bible's variations in repetition. Far from enhancing, these diminish predictability and thus go against the very *raison d'être* of redundancy in ordinary communication.¹¹

Variations interplay with repetitions not only to reduce the probability of reading superfluous meaning into a text but also to communicate *additional* information, such as a character's reliability or emotional state,¹² to give emphasis to a theme or to a scene,¹³ or to encourage a close reading.¹⁴ I would add that redundancy can complicate or communicate additional meaning about the *content* of what is repeated and not only its narrative context. That is, by repeating the same message in variant language each time from a

¹⁰ Sternberg points to the strict correspondence between the narrator's description of an event and a character's as a means of attaching a sense of reliability to the character (*Poetics*, 387-89). As an example, in Gen 16:4 the narrator claims that since Hagar "saw that she [Hagar] *had conceived*, her mistress *became contemptible in her eyes*." In the next verse, Sarai complains to her husband that "since she *saw* that she *had conceived*, I have become contemptible in her eyes." The repetition may seem superfluous as the same information about Hagar could be communicated either without the narrator's description or by having the narrator refer anaphorically to Sarai's statement: "Then Sarai told Abram *this*." But as Sternberg concludes, it helps the reader to *judge* positively the truth of Sarai's impressions so that "the information that looks redundant within one framework (the rendering of the world) finds its coherence within another (the judgment of the world)." One might compare the non-quotative repetition in John 5:8-9: Jesus tells the man to "Rise, carry your bed and walk," and the narrator comments that, "immediately the man became whole and *he carried his bed and walked*." The repetition underlines the efficacy of Jesus's word.

¹¹ Sternberg, *Poetics*, 371.

¹² Sternberg traces Eve's addition of "and you will not touch it" (Gen 3:3) to Yhwh's command in 2:16-17 to her discontent while he traces Samuel's omission of "Lord" from what Eli instructed him to say (1 Sam 3:9-10) to his awe before the Lord (*Poetics*, 393).

¹³ Witherup ("Functional Redundancy," 69) calls emphasis "the most obvious function" of repetition and seems to view it as only a first step in examining the role that repetition plays in the text. While this may be the case, we should nevertheless avoid glossing over the important fact that returning to a theme or speech act over and over again forces the reader to reconsider it multiple times. This in turn lends a certain amount of emphasis to whatever is being repeated, with greater frequency tending toward greater emphasis. Witherup also points to other functions such as correspondence, contrast, climax, and irony.

¹⁴ Chang (*Repetitions and Variations*, 36-42) includes connection between themes or sections, emphasis, structuring, retrospection, preview or foreshadowing, memory aid, and worship among the roles of repetition.

reliable source (such as Jesus) the text effectively eliminates certain interpretations while expanding the range of valid interpretations of the message along a different axis. Ambiguity is increased in some ways, decreased in others according to the ideology of the author. I will argue below (chapter 5) that this is what John does with messages regarding Jesus' departures and returns.

With regard to Sternberg, the necessity of a close reading is less important the more *local* (or close by) the repetitions are:¹⁵ the greater the distance between them, the more the storyteller relies on the memory, recognizability, or similarity of the narrative elements for the repetition to be effective. More immediate and more frequent repetitions are noticeable even in oral performance, as are their variations.¹⁶ In this sense, the internal quotations in Acts better serve a *reader* who has the opportunity to return to scenes many chapters apart and compare different versions of whole stories (see below), while those in John are better suited to a *listener* who can hear the variant quotations, often of a single sentence or clause, one right after the other.¹⁷ Consider the comments of Hellen Mardaga:

¹⁵ For a discussion of the problems presented by locality in repetition, especially as it differs between oral and textual communications, see Barbara Johnstone et al., "Repetition in Discourse: A Dialogue," in *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (2 vols.; ed. B. Johnstone; Norwood: Ablex Publishing, 1994), 1:1-20, here 4-5.

¹⁶ On the role of frequency, we might instead point to Matthew: having already used "Kingdom of Heaven" seven times in the first five chapters, it is immediately noticeable that Matthew switches to "Kingdom of God" in 6:33 despite the fact that it has been over 60 verses since the last time "Kingdom of Heaven" was used (cf. Matt 5:20). This is perhaps why Matthew's more typical phrase appears instead in several citations of 6:33 from the Church Fathers and a later lectionary (l 858, 12th century).

¹⁷ Noack (*Tradition*, 134) views the use of direct quotation (and direct speech generally) as a hangover from the oral stage of transmission. Likewise Victor Bers (*Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory* [Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997]) examines direct quotation as a performative device.

John's use of repetition (variation and amplification) not only serves the reading of a written text by an individual or a group. It also serves the reading of a written text aloud to a listening community. Studies on orality have shown that repetition stimulates the memory not only of the reader of the written text but also of the listening community.¹⁸

Mardaga analyzes the “lifted up” sayings, spread out over the first half of the gospel (3:14; 8:28; 12:32-34), through the lens of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*. Yet each of the examples of repetition and amplification that Mardaga gives from Quintilian follow each other immediately, in the next sentence or clause—including a case of direct internal quotation.¹⁹ Since Quintilian specifically writes about cases of oral rhetoric where local repetition would be more useful, while Mardaga writes about a text, even if a performative one, where infrequent and less local repetitions are still useful, we might say that Quintilian supports the point being made here.

The Fourth Gospel's use of inexact quotation does not set it apart from the Synoptic Gospels or Acts, all of which demonstrate similar freedom in citation (see Table 5 below). What does set the Fourth Gospel apart is that its quotations are *frequent*, often *verifiable*, and, especially, *local*. It is not so much that John presents trustworthy characters like Jesus or the narrator quoting inexactly; this is the norm. Instead there are *many more quotations* (more than twice as many as Acts, John's closest competitor and a significantly longer text), the original speech acts are *available for inspection* (unlike is

¹⁸ “The Repetitive Use of ὑψόω in the Fourth Gospel,” *CBQ* 74/1 (2012): 101-117, here 101-2.

¹⁹ Mardaga, “Repetitive Use,” 102-5. The case of DIQ (a paraphrase using subtraction and transposition) that she cites from Quintilian is an example of *ploce*, wherein the first word is repeated last after a long interval (*Inst. Or.* 9.3.40): “Yours (*vestrum*) is the work which we find here, conscript fathers, not mine (*non meum*), a fine piece of work too, but, as I have said (*ut dixi*), not mine (*non meum*) but yours (*vestrum*).” Even with the “lifted up” sayings there is still local repetition, in the first case through the use of analogy (the Son of Man must be *lifted up* like the bronze serpent was *lifted up*, 3:14), in the third through the use of DIQ, so that Jesus arguably prepares the listener for the recollection of 3:14 first by making a statement that also uses ὑψόω (“when I am lifted up,” 12:32) before having the crowd quote him using phrasing closer to the earlier verse (“the Son of Man must be lifted up,” 12:34).

frequently the case in Matthew, where almost all the DIQ are unverifiable), and *they are presented one after the other*. In Acts the closest verifiable quotations are 25 verses apart (Acts 10:6, 31), with most of the rest appearing several chapters apart. Meanwhile John has 14 quotations that appear *in the next verse* (see Table 1)!²⁰ These features make John's paraphrastic use of DIQ conspicuous, but not abnormal. Additionally, the quotations particularly in Matthew and Acts mostly arrive in clusters, either as a repetitious rhetorical device (Matthew) or in the retelling of whole stories (Acts). John's DIQ are surely clustered more heavily in certain chapters, as we will see either in the service of testimony or of teaching, but they are nonetheless spread more generally throughout the gospel.

A Case Study in Redundancy: Where Jesus Is Going

Repetition often requires multiple iterations to work, and here we have to differentiate between the repetition of DIQ as a device (i.e. the formal aspect), and the repetition of a particular statement or theme using DIQ (i.e. the content). Here we will use a case of the latter as a means to instruct us about the role of the former. The fact that the device is used so often makes it predictable in certain ways. As we will examine below, the Jews are nearly always the hostile party who quote others directly, and this consistent character trait makes their use of DIQ predictable: as soon as they are introduced into a scene, we can expect them to quote *someone*, and that quotation will signal their limited understanding of Jesus' words and mission.²¹ Yet despite having several dialogue scenes

²⁰ Proximity is a major factor in the scribal tendency to harmonize quotations as well. See the Appendix.

²¹ This use of "the Jews" is especially glaring in John 9: initially "the Pharisees" lead the trial against the man born blind (cf. 9:13-17), but after "the Jews" appear (9:18) they immediately (and proleptically, cf. 9:20) quote the man's parents (9:19, "...whom you say, 'he was born blind'?"), initially to demonstrate that

with Jesus, the disciples never quote him until late in the farewell discourse, in an excessively repetitive back-and-forth regarding a topic that has already confused the Jews:

Jesus' imminent departure in "a little while" (μικρόν):

John 16:16-19: "A little while (μικρόν)²² and you no longer see me, and again a little while (μικρόν) and you will see me."

So his disciples said to one another, "What is this that he says to us, 'A little while (μικρόν) and you do not see me, and again a little while (μικρόν) and you will see me' and, 'Because I go to the Father' [cf. 16:10]?" Then they were saying, "What is this [that he says], the 'little while (μικρόν)'? We do not know what he is saying."

Jesus knew what they wanted to ask him, and he said to them, "Are you discussing (ζητεῖτε)²³ with each other because I said, 'A little while (μικρόν) and you do not see me, and again a little while (μικρόν) and you will see me'?"

Although the entire departure sequence confuses them, the disciples draw particular attention to the "little while," the temporal dimension, within this brief interchange by forcing a sevenfold repetition of the word and by isolating this element of the quotation specifically for consideration.²⁴ The intense focus on μικρόν helps to recall the first time it appeared:

John 7:33-34: So Jesus said, "I am with you yet a little time (ἔτι χρόνον μικρόν) and I go to the one who sent me.²⁵ You will seek me and you will not find [me], and where I am you cannot come."

the man was not born blind. When the testimony of the parents forces them to accept that he was, they want to prove that Jesus sinned in healing him (notice that their question is not *who* healed him, but *how* he was healed). Meanwhile the audience knows that either position is a misunderstanding of the true situation.

²² Only the word μικρόν appears throughout in this scene; ἔτι χρόνον μικρόν in full appears in John 7:33 and 12:35.

²³ The use of ζητέω in this sense is unique in John. Bultmann (*John*, 577 n. 7 and 177 n. 3) and George L. Parsenios (*Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif* [WUNT 258; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 50-51 n. 10), however, rightly recall the dispute (ζήτησις, 3:25) between the Baptist's disciples and a Jew regarding purification/baptism.

²⁴ Hartwig Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 669-71.

²⁵ In fact, the connections to 7:33-34 began several verses earlier. In 7:33, Jesus says that *after* the little while, "I go to the one who sent me" (ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με). In 16:5, he tells the disciples, "*Now* I go to the one who sent me" (νῦν δὲ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με). Although Jesus's claim that he *goes* is

As we have already seen, the Jews quote the second sentence in support of the interpretation that Jesus will go to teach in the Diaspora (7:35-36). A similar scene plays out in 8:21-24, when Jesus says again (πάλιν) that he is going and the Jews quote him (exactly if only partially) in support of a new interpretation: that he will kill himself.

The language returns²⁶ at the beginning of the farewell discourses when Jesus tells the disciples (13:33), “Little children, I am with you yet a little while (ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι)” before quoting what he said to the Jews in 8:21. Here it is Peter’s turn to misunderstand, first by asking where Jesus is going.²⁷ Jesus paraphrases (without quoting) what he has already said: “Where I am going you cannot *follow* (ἀκολουθεῖσαι) me *now*, but you will *follow later*” (13:36). Peter, still not getting it, asks why he cannot follow Jesus *now* when he is willing to lay down his life for Jesus (13:37).²⁸ Jesus’ response, with predictions of Peter’s denials, highlights that he has misunderstood his master’s departure language: it is Jesus’ time to lay down his life, not Peter’s.²⁹ In other

not rare, nor are references to God as “the one who sent me,” John 7:33 and 16:5 mark the only two occasions that they are used together.

²⁶ “Yet a little while” also appears in 12:35, just after a crowd questions how Jesus can say, “the Son of Man must be lifted up,” since they have heard from the law that “the Christ remains forever” (12:34). The crowd has misunderstood him on temporal grounds: there seems to be a contradiction in Jesus’ claim to be *lifted up* (killed, according to the narrator, 12:33) *soon* (12:35), and the notion that the Christ remains forever (12:34). Like many of the misunderstandings, the solution is inclusive: Jesus as the Christ will *both* be crucified/exalted in a little while *and* remain forever.

²⁷ Like the Jews, Peter has missed that Jesus is “going *to the one who sent me*” (7:33; cf. 16:5). Asking this question also associates Peter with the Pharisees who do not know *where Jesus is going* (8:14).

²⁸ As Brown points out (*John*, 2:616), the change of vocabulary (“come” to “follow”) and the introduction of “later” (ὕστερον) becomes important in Peter’s restoration scene (21:15-19), where Peter’s death is alluded to (with a clarification of “later”: ὅταν γηράσῃς) and Jesus gives him the definitive command, “*follow me*” (cf. also 21:22).

²⁹ It is possible that having Peter specifically draw his sword at Jesus’ arrest *by a Roman cohort* illustrates his misunderstanding as well (Brown, *John*, 2:812): either he expects heavenly assistance (which is not coming) or he expects to die at their hands (when, as he should know, it is not his time).

words, while Jesus tries to draw the disciples closer to him by *avoiding* negative clauses from his earlier statements (“you will not find me,” or “you will die in your sin”) and at least allowing that they will follow him one day, Peter resists just as the Jews did. In doing so, he is characterized closer to them than to Jesus.

By the time we overhear the cluster of fumbling quotations in 16:16-19 we have been trained by the repetitive use of DIQ—in particular regarding this exact issue—to interpret them as signaling misunderstanding. Soon after, the disciples’ boldly declare (16:29-30): “*Now* you speak plainly and you do not speak in any figure of speech! *Now* we know (οἶδαμεν) that you know all things... We believe in this, that you have come from God (ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες)!”³⁰ By having repeatedly emphasized that the disciples will only understand these things *later* (cf. also 13:7), the reader might sympathize with Jesus’ doubt more sharply when he asks (16:31), “Do you believe *now*?” In the next verse he predicts that they will soon be scattered, leaving him alone.

This ongoing cluster of quotations spanning ten chapters works just as Suleiman understands repetition. Along the way John eliminates from consideration the interpretations 1) that Jesus meant to leave Judea and teach among the Greeks (in the flesh), 2) that he wanted to commit suicide, and 3) that Peter or any other disciple should have died with or for Jesus.³¹ Yet it also functions as Sternberg and Witherup understand repetition:

³⁰ Compare Nicodemus (3:2), “Rabbi, we know (οἶδαμεν) that you are a teacher come from God (ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας).” However positively we might view Nicodemus, at this point he is at best at the beginning of his journey toward understanding. That the disciples are still at the same, much earlier level of understanding does not speak well of them, especially since now Jesus is trying to communicate where he is going and when he will return, not where he is from.

³¹ Any of these ideas are theoretically plausible in the first century, although undocumented elsewhere. On the third issue, see Jesus’ predictive citation of Zech. 13:7 (16:32; cf. Mark 14:27 // Matt 26:31) that the sheep will be scattered, and the denial predictions, as well as the accusation by Celsus against Jesus’ disc-

the *formal similarities* with the Jews highlight the lack of understanding of the disciples,³² an incomprehension that reaches its climax in the excessive repetition of 16:16-19, while the *differences in content* clarify that the disciples at least have the hope of understanding Jesus' predictions after their fulfillment.³³ When we return to these verses in chapter 5, we will also see that John uses repetition to modify our understanding of their content as well, shifting the emphasis between Jesus' returns in resurrection, the church, and *parousia* as it progresses.

Part II: Direct Internal Quotation and the Johannine Trial Motif

Even if we agree that DIQ serves the sort of redundant functions just examined, the question remains: why repeat through direct quotation specifically? Repetition *without* quotation allows for paraphrase and the nuancing of a particular idea, as it does in John 6:40, 54, where *both* "everyone who sees the Son and believes in him" *and* "the one who eats my flesh and drinks my blood" have eternal life, "and I will raise him on the last day." Likewise, when Jesus tells a crowd, "you are *seeking to kill me*" (7:19), they can

iples (plural) of giving him up beforehand (*Ag. Cels.* 2.9; n. 161 below). Although the Fourth Gospel is still critical of Peter, the misunderstanding scene in John 13 and Peter's haste to fight the Roman attackers in John 18 may serve to defend him against accusations of cowardice.

³² Cf. Bultmann, *John*, 577: "The disciples are as far from understanding what Jesus has said about his departure as the Jews had been earlier (7.36)."

³³ John sets up a pattern in which none of the predictions by or about Jesus are understood *in the story world* until after they are fulfilled (cf. for example John 1:31, 33 [on the coming one whom John did not know *until* the predicted Spirit descends on him], or 11:4, 11, 23 [on the resurrection of Lazarus; cf. 11:39]), while all predictive statements by other characters are either wrong (e.g. 11:56, "he [Jesus] will not come to the feast" when in fact he must) or at best only ironically true (e.g. 7:27, "when the Christ comes, no one will know where he is from" because they know Jesus is from Galilee, yet do not know that he is from the Father/above). The consistent fulfillment of Jesus' predictions show that they are trustworthy, so that the audience may also trust the predictions that go beyond the narrative, such as his promises to raise believers on the last day. Nonetheless the narrative is keen to guide the audience's interpretations of these predictions so that it does not make the same mistakes as the story world characters.

simply respond, “Who is *seeking to kill* you?” (7:20). They do not need to quote him to refer to his previous speech act. Citing the speech act directly must play its own role.

Given the frequency of narrative asides, interruptions, and so-called aporias in John, we might expect DIQ to appear in cases of *repetitive resumption*—that is, repeating a few lexical elements to help the audience recall where the narrative left off prior to an interruption. However, outside of a handful of cases (see 4:29, 39; 8:21-22, 24; 18:5, 8), repetitive resumption does not seem to have been a major motivator for using DIQ.³⁴ Whereas the model of repetitive resumption comes out of the redaction-critical camp because it seems to point to the chaotic nature of the Fourth Gospel,³⁵ advocates for the structural unity and coherence of John are more likely to point to repetition as a *structural marker* in the gospel’s overall design.³⁶ Perhaps inspired by the many chiasms in 1 John, scholars most often seek out chiastic designs to explain the present form of the gospel.³⁷ If any have happened on the truth, then DIQ does not seem to have played a

³⁴ On John 18:5-8, see chapter 2 above. On the other cases, see von Wahlde, John, 2:190, 387. It may be possible to view the Baptist’s self-quotation in 1:30 as picking up where he left off (1:27) after the two-day structure was imposed on his testimony, in a similar way that he repeats his declaration of the Lamb on the third day (cf. 1:29, 36).

³⁵ See James M. Robinson (and Helmut Koester), *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 244-45; Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:44-46; M.-E. Boismard, “Un procédé rédactionnel dans le quatrième évangile: La *Wiederaufnahme*,” in *L’Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (BETL 44; ed. M. de Jonge; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1978), 235-41.

³⁶ *Structural* unity, i.e. a coherent and marked literary design, is a separate issue from *authorial* unity, which was the source of DIQ alleged by several of the scholars surveyed in chapter 1, who argue for DIQ as a literary tendency of the sole author. A single but haphazard author can produce an incoherent text, and a text derived from multiple hands or sources can be constructed in a careful and highly structured manner. The latter is likely the case with the Fourth Gospel, although whether DIQ serves as one of John’s repetitive literary markers is doubtful.

³⁷ See J.J.C. Willemse, *Het vierde evangelie: Een onderzoek naar zijn structuur* (Hilversum: Brand, 1965); John W. Welch, “Chiasmus in the New Testament,” in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis* (ed. J.W. Welch; Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 211-49; E.C. Webster, “Pattern in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature* (ed. D.J.A. Clines, D.M. Gunn, and A.J.

significant role: the device undermines the structures detected more often than it supports them.³⁸ The Gospel of John is so repetitive *in general* that these sorts of structures are easy to find yet difficult to disconfirm, hence the wide variety of chiasms put forward.³⁹

Yet verifiable internal quotation, because it is repetitive, can signal the structural unity of the text in some places. Each of the scenes in which the Baptist appears is tied together in part through DIQ (cf. 1:1-18, 19-34; 3:22-30), creating a coherent portrait of his testimony, and the use of DIQ contributes to parallels between the Nicodemus and Baptist material in the third chapter.⁴⁰ Direct internal quotation (in 3:7 and 4:10) is one of several features that invite a comparison between Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman.⁴¹ Additionally the device helps to form an inclusio around the first farewell

Hauser; JSOTSup 19; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1982), 230-57; Peter F. Ellis, "Inclusion, Chiasm, and the Division of the Fourth Gospel," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 43/3-4 (1999): 269-338, building on work from his earlier *The Genius of John: A Composition-Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1984); George Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987).

³⁸ Within Ellis' very detailed structure, six cases of DIQ contribute positively to chiasms while at least nine cases are ignored by Ellis because they undermine the chiasm he finds despite ample repetition (John 4:10, 53; 5:12; 8:33; 9:11; 10:36; 11:51-52; 16:19; 18:6, 8).

³⁹ Consider only the center of the macro-chiasm: Willemse finds it in John 9:1-7, Ellis in 6:1-15, and Webster in the four chapters from 9:1-12:50. Fernando Segovia's comments on Mlakuzhyil's arrangement might easily apply to any of the studies: "The overall proposal... is also quite problematic and unconvincing. In many cases... the delineation of the proposed structural units, whether major or minor, is highly debatable and not at all as objective as claimed. In many cases, furthermore, the proposed chiastic arrangements appear quite forced" ("Review of *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*," *CBQ* 51 [1989]: 749-50). A similar problem, among many others, attends the pentagrammic model advocated by John J. Gerhard (*The Miraculous Parallelisms of John: A Golden Mold of Symmetric Patterns* [Tangerine: Orlando Truth, 2006]).

⁴⁰ Although his argument that the Baptist continues to speak through 3:36 is not quite convincing, Jeffrey Wilson demonstrates the parallel structures of 3:1-21 and 3:22-36, where 3:5-8 (containing Jesus' self-citation in 3:7) parallels 3:28-31 (containing John's self-citation in 3:28, although Wilson surprisingly omits 3:28 from consideration) ("The Integrity of John 3:22-36," *JSNT* 10 [1981]: 34-41).

⁴¹ Mary Margaret Pazdan ("Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Modes of Discipleship," *BTB* 17/4 [1987]: 145-48) compares the two scenes in terms of characterization, but highlights similarities in structure. John 3:2-10, which develops the polyvalent "birth ἄνωθεν" (in part through Jesus' self-citation

discourse (14:28/14:3-4).⁴² Again, however, DIQ as a structural marker does not seem to have been a terribly frequent motivator to use the device on its own.

A more promising repetitive structure is the “riddling session” detected by Tom Thatcher.⁴³ The idea of Johannine riddles was advocated by Herbert Leroy, who found eleven riddles of Jesus, all involving double entendre of some sort that the secondary characters misunderstand by supplying the wrong referent (e.g. “living water” as flowing water), but for which informed readers could supply the correct one (“living water” as a spiritual gift).⁴⁴ Seven of Leroy’s eleven riddles involve DIQ.⁴⁵ While Leroy approached riddles from a form-critical perspective, Thatcher approaches them through the perspective of folkloristics. Doing so allows him to broaden his definition of what constitutes a riddle and provides a new, repetitive device to explain how misunderstandings are strung

in 3:7), is placed in parallel with 4:7-15, which develops the polyvalent “living water” (in part through Jesus’ self-citation in 4:10).

⁴² Jesus quotes himself in 14:28 as saying “I go” (ὑπάγω) and “I come to you” (ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς); he says the former only in 14:4, and although he says “I come again” (πάλιν ἔρχομαι) in 14:3, he says “I come to you” precisely in 14:18. The quotation is not the only marker of inclusio: stronger is the exact repetition of “do not let your heart be troubled” in 14:1, 27. A chiasmic structure has been detected in the farewell discourse (13:31-17:26) where 14:1-31 pairs with 16:4b-33, to which these terms could contribute (cf. the use of ὑπάγω in 16:5, 10, quoted in 16:17), but Brown cautions, “in the discovery of this chiasmic pattern we may be dealing more with the interpreter’s ingenuity than with the final redactor’s intent” (*John*, 2:597).

⁴³ Thatcher explores this idea in two books (*The Riddles of Jesus in John: A Study in Tradition and Folklore* [SBLMS 53; Atlanta: SBL, 2000] and *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006]), and in two essays: “The Riddles of Jesus in the Johannine Dialogues,” in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (ed. R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 263-80 and “Riddles, Repetitions, and the Literary Unity of the Johannine Discourses,” in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation* (BETL 223; ed. G. Van Belle, M. Labahn, and P. Maritz; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 357-77.

⁴⁴ *Rätsel und Missverständnis: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannevangeliums* (BBB 30; Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1968), 1-2. See above, chapter 2 n. 2 on Johannine double-entendre.

⁴⁵ They are 1) 3:3, 5; 2) 4:10-15; 3) 6:32-35, 41-42; 4) 7:33-36; 5) 8:21-24; 6) 8:31-33; and 7) 8:51-53.

together, one after the other: the riddling session.⁴⁶ Riddles allow the riddler to challenge normal ways of thinking by prompting the listener to detect the proper surplus of meaning in the words of the riddle over their more obvious meaning.⁴⁷ Paraphrastic DIQ is perfectly suited both to test potential interpretations (“Are you really saying...?”) and to reinterpret the statement in answers (“No, what I really meant was...”). Thatcher finds over 40 riddles in John, perhaps 15 of which involve DIQ.⁴⁸ This is a substantial amount of quotations, but there are limitations, such as the riddling session’s inability to explain unverifiable quotations or cases where the quotation is distant from the original statement.⁴⁹ The main advantage of Thatcher’s model is in providing *agonistic* and *performative* circumstances to help explain the speech patterns in John.⁵⁰ Both features are important in the use of testimony, which can explain an even greater number of quotations.

In an examination of *oratio recta* in Greek literature, Victor Bers recognizes that an air of authenticity is often the rhetorical intent of direct quotation, which carries a “stronger flavor of undiluted *mimesis*.”⁵¹ The sense of authenticity given to direct speech

⁴⁶ Thatcher, “Riddles,” 365. Each riddle is followed by confusion and an answer.

⁴⁷ Thatcher, “Riddles,” 366.

⁴⁸ The sessions are mainly in John 4; 6; 7-8; 10; 11; and 14. The cases involving DIQ are 3:3; 4:7; 6:36-40; 7:34; 8:21, 24, 31-32, 51; 9:39; 11:25-26 (?); 13:10, 33; 14:7; 16:16; 21:22.

⁴⁹ See below, chapters 4 and 5, for more on disjointed cases of misunderstanding.

⁵⁰ Thatcher, “Riddles,” 357-58.

⁵¹ Bers, *Speech in Speech*, 3; importantly, Bers allows that the perception of direct quotations as “endowed with unusual authenticity is, of course, naïve.” See also p. 15: direct speech “is not only ‘highlighted’ in a general sense, but also suggests a greater attention to the precise wording of the ‘original’.” On the authenticating role of direct speech in biblical literature, see Arnim D. Baum, “Zu Funktion und Authentizitätsanspruch der *oratio recta*: Hebräische und griechische Geschichtsschreibung im Vergleich,” *ZAW* 115 (2003): 586-607 and Philipp F. Bartholomä, *The Johannine Discourses and the Teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics* (TANZ 57; Tübingen: Francke, 2012), 69-82.

is probably why certain texts gravitate toward it, such as a report from a lawsuit (49 CE) where direct speech is repeatedly introduced without embellishment:

P. Oxy. 37.4-8: Aristocles, advocate (ῥήτωρ) for Pesouris: “Pesouris, for whom I speak... picked up a boy foundling, named Heraclas, from the gutter.”⁵²

Other times a bit of introduction is warranted, as in the report of a legal decision from the second or third century CE:

P. Oxy. 40.4-7: Psasnis came forward and said (εἰπόντος), “Being a doctor by profession, I treated these people who have given me a public burden.”⁵³

Even with a recorder present it is unlikely that the text represents the actual words spoken on the occasion unless a written statement (which was read *verbatim*) was also presented and copied.⁵⁴ Instead the words most likely represent paraphrased statements to which the litigants could agree, presented in the text however as their actual words. Second, it may be noticed that the texts in question are reports of legal proceedings where the air of authenticity would be important when citing a witness or a litigant.⁵⁵ Indeed, the Gospel

⁵² Translations of the Oxyrhynchus papyri are my own. Greek texts and dates taken from B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (80 vols.; London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898-2008).

⁵³ See, for example, a legal report from 136 CE (*P. Oxy.* 707): Sarapion, the advocate for Plutarchus, said (εἶπεν): “Plutarchus leased...” Another report from 115 CE (*P. Oxy.* 706) presents almost a dialogue: “...according to the law.’ And he said (εἶπεν) to Damarion, ‘...and I pay if he should blame you’.”

⁵⁴ Another legal report (146 CE) ascribes direct speech to “the priest and recorder (ὑπομνηματόγραφος)” only (*P. Oxy.* 1102) while summarizing responses from the litigants, which may be evidence that the priest could confidently record his own statements but did not feel confident recording the words of the litigants directly. However the partial document records just the priest’s delivery of a verdict and several amendments based on the litigants’ responses, so perhaps only his words were relevant at this point in the text.

⁵⁵ That witnesses can slip into direct quotation of each other is evident, for example, in the *Tabulae Herculanenses* from 74 CE, where a witness claims: “There I heard Stephanus, Petronia Themis’s husband, say to Vitalis, ‘Why do you act against the daughter, since we consider her the same as a daughter?’” (*ibi me audisse dicen/tem Stephanu(m) [mari]t[um] / Themidis Petroniae / Vitali quid invides ff[i]/liae cum eam nos / filiae lo[co] fa[ciamus]*), or in the later *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (320 CE): “I heard from the mouth of the Bishop himself: ‘I was given a silver lamp and a silver casket, and these I gave up’” (*ore ipsius episcopi audiui: data est mihi lucerna argentea, et capitulata argentea, et has tradidi*; translations from Rolando Ferri, “Witness and Lawyer in the Roman Courts: Linguistic Strategies of Evasiveness and Intimidation in

of John's role as a forensic document, presenting directly the testimony of the Beloved Disciple and the testimony of its characters through narration, is the most important reason to present citations as direct quotes. However, it may be helpful to briefly examine how John fills the role of a forensic document before turning to the ways in which DIQ supports that role.

The passion narrative of the Fourth Gospel is odd in that it quietly skips over Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin (cf. 18:24, 28). Instead, trial material is spread throughout the gospel, creating a well-recognized lawsuit motif that gives many of the scenes in John its flavor.⁵⁶ Questions asked in Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin in the Synoptics appear instead in scenes of conflict with the Jews many months prior to his arrest.⁵⁷ Legal vocabulary related to testimony, judgment, and truth colors these scenes:⁵⁸

[J]uridical terms and arguments are notably frequent in the [Johannine] Gospel and Epistles—the Christ who is sent, witness, judge, judgment, accuse, convince, Paraclete. Even terms of a rather mystical character, like light and truth, reveal if

Roman Trial Debates," *Incontri di Filologia Classica* 12 [2012-2013]: 57-99). It is not only court documents where direct citations are abundant, but any situation where the authenticity of speech needs to be underlined, as for example in the proceedings of a senate meeting (*P. Oxy.* 1103) or the record of a public assembly in honor of a praefect's visit (*P. Oxy.* 41).

⁵⁶ As an incomplete bibliography of literature on this subject, see Théo Preiss, "Justification in Johannine Thought," in *Life in Christ* (Naperville: A.R. Allenson, 1957), 9-31; Josef Blank, *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie* (Freiburg: Lambertus, 1964); Pancaro, *Law in the Fourth Gospel*; A.E. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1976); Jerome H. Neyrey, "Jesus the Judge: Forensic Process in John 8:21-59," *Biblica* 68/4 (1987): 509-42 and "The Trials (Forensic) and Tribulations (Honor Challenges) of Jesus: John 7 in Social Scientific Perspective," *BTB* 26/3 (1996): 107-24; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000); Parsenios, *Rhetoric and Drama*; Per Jarle Bekken, *The Lawsuit Motif in John's Gospel from New Perspectives: Jesus Christ, Crucified Criminal and Emperor of the World* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

⁵⁷ See Raymond E. Brown, "Incidents that Are Units in the Synoptic Gospels but Dispersed in St. John," *CBQ* 23/2 (1961): 143-60, esp. 148-52 and below, n. 155.

⁵⁸ According to Lincoln (*Truth on Trial*, 12-13), μαρτυρία occurs 14 times (four times in all Synoptics combined), μαρτυρέω 33 times (twice in the Synoptics), κρίνω 19 times (six in Matthew, six in Luke), κρίσις 11 times (four in Luke, 12 in Matthew), and words related to truth 30 times compared to 11 in the Synoptics.

considered from this standpoint a very marked juridicial emphasis: truth is contrasted less with error than with falsehood, and less with falsehood in general than with false witness.⁵⁹

The gospel begins by repeatedly referring to the testimony of John the Baptist (see 1:7-8, 15, 19, 32, 34)⁶⁰ and ends by referring to the testimony of the Beloved Disciple, marked as the authority behind the gospel (21:24; cf. 19:35?): “In the theological vision of the Fourth Gospel, therefore, the entire life of Jesus is a legal drama that begins and ends with the testimony of reliable witnesses.”⁶¹

The implied author’s role as a witness is also important in understanding how the gospel presents the conflicts of Jesus and the Jews: “It is as if John, like an advocate, re-opens the case of Jesus, drawing on new evidence provided by divine testimonies and the legal precedents of the Law, which are appropriate in order to plead for a new assessment of the case.”⁶² The gospel’s function as testimony to its audience allows the narrator to testify, to comment on testimony, and to present a case against Jesus’ opponents. On the model of the heavenly lawsuit found in Isaiah 40-55, Andrew Lincoln presents the trial as

⁵⁹ Preiss, “Justification,” 11.

⁶⁰ Not to mention confession (ὁμολογέω, 1:20 twice). John 1:15 introduces the Baptist’s self-citation with “he testifies (μαρτυρεῖ)... and has cried out (κέκραγεν).” Harvey (*Jesus on Trial*, 23 n. 7) highlights the confluence of μαρτυρέω and κράζω in Demosthenes (18.132), Plutarch (*Cato the Younger*, 58.1), and *P. Oxy.* 717 (late first century, in a forensic context and ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ) as well as *P. Oxy.* 2353 (κραζόμενα φάσκεῖς καὶ ἐγὼ φάσκω). See also Rom 8:15-16, and below on Acts 23:6; 24:21. Additionally, E.D. Freed (“Jn 1,19-27 in Light of Related Passages in John, the Synoptics, and Acts,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* [BETL 100; 3 vols.; eds. F. van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992], 3:1943-61, here 3:1951) points out that the construction “give answer” appears only in John 1:22 and in Jesus’ trial in 19:9.

⁶¹ Parsenios, *Rhetoric and Drama*, 2. See also Dorothy E. Lee, “Witness in the Fourth Gospel: John the Baptist and the Beloved Disciple as Counterparts,” *ABR* 61 (2013): 1-17.

⁶² Bekken, *Lawsuit Motif*, 2. On the same page Bekken makes the important point that the trial is not the *only* goal of the Fourth Gospel regarding Jesus, where “his execution as a crucified criminal was remoulded and explicated in a positive way, in order to become an *apologia* for the scandal of the cross and *at the same time a bold gospel about Jesus*” (emphasis added).

running throughout the gospel while George Parsenios, on models taken from Greek rhetoric and tragedy, understands much of the gospel as a legal investigation (ζήτησις) leading up to the depiction of Jesus' actual trial before Pilate.⁶³ Per Jarle Bekken, meanwhile, understands John as a "crimes-legal proceedings-execution" report, with analogies in Jewish historiographical writings and in Greco-Roman texts.⁶⁴ For us, the particular generic aspirations of the authors are less important than the pervasiveness of the lawsuit motif in the Fourth Gospel.

Direct internal quotation is one way that John incorporates the trial motif throughout the gospel. Or, put another way, presenting Jesus' life as constantly on trial provides a major motivation for using DIQ frequently and consistently throughout the gospel, but especially in forensic scenes. To demonstrate this, we will look at some examples of how DIQ is used in trial narratives and other forensic settings in four relevant areas of literature. First we will look at the forensic defense, using Plato's *Apology* as our primary case study. Second we will look at trial scenes in Greek novelistic literature, this time using Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Finally we will turn to the biblical texts, briefly returning to the use of DIQ in juridicial settings in the Septuagint before exam-

⁶³ Parsenios builds on the work of E.J. Bickerman, "Utilitas Crucis," (in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* [AJEC 68/2; 3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2007], 726-93, translated from *RHR* 112 [1935]), and is followed in his generic assessment by Myers, "Juridicial Rhetoric," 425-26. Parsenios compares John, especially its use of *seeking* and *finding*, to Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The Greek tragedians were particularly averse to direct quotation even in trial narratives, Sophocles more so than others (see Bers, *Speech in Speech*, 44-46), but even here direct quotations appear (cp. *Oed. Tyr.* 715-16, 29-30) and indirect quotations are abundant.

⁶⁴ Bekken, *Lawsuit Motif*, 1, 7-11; he follows Adela Yarbro Collins ("The Genre of the Passion Narrative," *ST* 47 [1993]: 3-28) and Peder Borgen ("The Scriptures and the Words and Works of Jesus," in *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies* [ed. T. Thatcher; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007], 39-58) in this, but draws mainly on trial scenes in the works of Philo to explain the importation of theological motifs into a trial setting.

ining how DIQ tends to appear more frequently in forensic contexts in the other literature of the New Testament.

Direct Internal Quotation in Forensic Defenses: Plato's *Apology*

The citations in Plato's *Apology* actually begin with an unverifiable and indirect quotation. Socrates acknowledges to the jurors that they have been told the lie: "You should be careful not to be deceived by an accomplished speaker like me" (17ab).⁶⁵ His accusers probably said something along these lines since orators occasionally pretended that they were unembellished speakers (as Socrates does here) while emphasizing the preparation and rhetorical skill of their opponents (as Socrates' opponents have apparently done).⁶⁶ The "lie" is also quite similar to one of the present charges against Socrates: that he makes the weaker argument stronger. There is some scholarly dispute regarding this latter charge since Socrates never counters it specifically.⁶⁷ It is possible, since the charge impacts how the jurors will hear his defense, that Socrates anticipates and counters it with a prolonged denunciation of his own rhetorical skill (17a-18a).

As for the charges, Socrates quotes them on several occasions. They come from two fronts: the old slanders that may prejudice the jury and the present accusations brought by Meletus and Anytus. Socrates does not move neatly from one to the other.

⁶⁵ English translations, sometimes modified for clarity, from *Plato: Five Dialogues* (trans. G.M.A. Grube; Indianapolis: Hackett, 1981).

⁶⁶ Cf. Lysias 19.1.2; Isaeus 10.1 for similar contrasts, although lacking direct quotations.

⁶⁷ Alexander Sesonske ("To Make the Weaker Argument the Stronger," *JHP* 6 [1968]: 217-31) unsatisfactorily argues that the charge is never answered because it is essentially true, at least from the perspective of the Athenians. That is, Socrates more or less admits (at the story level) his guilt on this charge in the eyes of the Athenians while implicitly distancing himself (at the narrative level) from the Sophists, of whom the charge is true from Plato's perspective. Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith (*Socrates on Trial* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989], 68) argue more convincingly that Socrates cannot *argue* directly and effectively that he *fails to argue* effectively, so he sprinkles evidence counter to the charge throughout his defense, beginning as early as 17d.

Instead he overlaps the old slanders with the present accusations, which helps to give the present ones an air of rumor and gossip:

18bc: But these earlier ones, gentlemen, they got a hold of most of you from childhood, persuaded you and accused me quite falsely: “There is a certain Socrates, a wise man, a thinker⁶⁸ about the things in the sky and investigates all things below the earth (τά τε μετέωρα φροντιστής καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γῆς πάντα ἀνεξή-τηκώς) who makes the weaker argument stronger (τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιῶν).”

19bc: As if they were my actual prosecutors, it is necessary to ‘read’ their sworn accusations: “Socrates is guilty and busies himself investigating the things below the earth and the heavenly things (περιεργάζεται ζητῶν τὰ τε ὑπὸ γῆς καὶ οὐράνια) and making the weaker argument stronger (τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιῶν), and teaching these same things to others (ἄλλους ταῦτά ταῦτα διδάσκων).”

Notice that while the first charge of investigating natural phenomena is paraphrased significantly in the later citation, the second, stereotyped charge (of making the weaker argument stronger) is repeated exactly.⁶⁹ Meanwhile Socrates adds a third charge of teaching these things to others, drawing in one of the accusations made against him by Meletus, that he corrupts the youth through his teaching (cf. 23d). It is a reasonable ploy: if he has been slandered in this way for years without being found guilty of any crime, how can they convict him now?

⁶⁸ The noun (φροντιστής), probably used pejoratively, does not appear in later citations of the charges and may be Socrates’ own paraphrase anticipating the mention of Aristophanes, who introduces Socrates in a “thinkery” (φροντιστήριον; *Clouds*, 94) (Paul A. Miller and Charles Platter, *Plato’s Apology of Socrates: A Commentary* [Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010], 25).

⁶⁹ Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1402a) and Isocrates (*Antidosis*, 15), both of whom are familiar with the *Apology*, present the saying nearly identically to Plato (although Isocrates in the plural). Meanwhile Aristophanes, who precedes Plato, uses much of the same vocabulary directed at Socrates without citing the saying directly, although he presents the idea as something commonly voiced; see *Clouds*, 112-13: “They say (φασίν) there are both arguments with them, the stronger, whatever it is, and the weaker. Of these different arguments the weaker, they say (φασι), wins while speaking unjustly” (cp. 882-85).

Socrates doubles down on this ploy when he quotes the old slanders a third time:

23d: But, so as not to appear at a loss, those accusations that are at hand against all philosophers, these things they say: “things in the sky and things under the earth” (τὰ μετέωρα καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γῆς), and “not acknowledging gods” (θεοὺς μὴ νομίζειν), and “making the weaker argument stronger” (τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν).

The first charge is dismissively shortened but closer to the original wording, and the second appears only with a change in verb form. But a third accusation is sandwiched in merely as one that is always at hand to throw at philosophers, namely not acknowledging the gods. This also happens to be one of Meletus’ accusations against Socrates.

Indeed Socrates has an eye on the present accusations throughout his defense. He takes on the charge of teaching, introduced only in the second citation, before any of the others (19d-23b). Then, just before he quotes the old slanders for the third time, Socrates discusses the tendency of young men to imitate him in questioning others. The self-important men whom they question, thinking themselves wise, get angry at Socrates rather than the young men and certainly not at their own lack of wisdom:

23d: And they say, “That Socrates is a pestilential fellow and he corrupts the young (διαφθείρει τοὺς νέους).”

The latter is one of Meletus’ charges against him, here presented as the common reaction of the arrogant. In every case after this where Socrates quotes the present charges (24b, c, d; 25d; 26b)—that he corrupts the youth, fails to acknowledge the gods that the city acknowledges, and introduces new spiritual beings—he quotes them indirectly.⁷⁰ Giving the charges a direct voice here allows Socrates to blend accusations with gossip: what

⁷⁰ In Xenophon’s *Apology* the charges against Socrates are quoted directly by Hermogenes (through Xenophon, *Ap.* 10; cp. John 6:41) and by Socrates (*Ap.* 12). However, Socrates later quotes the charges, attributed to Meletus, indirectly (*Ap.* 19).

Meletus presents as formal charges are really the petulant reactions of the arrogant and unwise.⁷¹ Socrates makes one exception to his string of indirect citations: in 27a he *paraphrases* Meletus directly as saying, “Socrates is guilty of not acknowledging gods, but also of acknowledging gods.”

The charges against Socrates do not pertain to bad acts so much as bad *speaking* and the effects it has on others.⁷² Accordingly, Socrates focuses in his defense on the words of his opponents, countering them with his own citations. In addition to those already discussed, Socrates indirectly quotes the oracle of Delphi regarding him (21a), and offers (directly) a more humble paraphrase of it (23b);⁷³ he directly quotes a conversation with Callias to demonstrate that there are teachers available who take fees, if that is worthy of a trial (20a-c); he quotes Homer to counter the idea that he should regret putting himself in mortal danger (28b-d; cf. also 34d) as well as his accuser, Anytus (indirectly), who said that Socrates must be executed now that he has been brought to trial (29c);⁷⁴ and he quotes proverbs to support his claim not to be bothered by death (40c, e). Socrates also quotes himself, both what he has just said (cf. 29c, d; 31c and 33c)

⁷¹ Before he gets to the charges, Socrates directly (if paraphrastically) quotes in 24a and 28a a claim he made in 19a. Socrates mockingly quotes Meletus as calling himself “the good and patriotic” (24b), although indirectly, before citing the charges that he has brought, continuing the personal attack on his accuser. Socrates will also twice claim that Meletus does not actually care about any of this (24c; 25c), each time followed by an indirect self-citation that he has proven what he said (24d; 26ab).

⁷² As Socrates points out (33d-34b), the true focus is on what he has said since the accusers have yet to produce any actual witnesses that he has corrupted the youth.

⁷³ Presumably the same oracle is quoted indirectly by Xenophon (*Ap.* 14), although there Socrates is free, just, and prudent rather than wise. Compare the variance in the Baptist’s oracle about the coming one, examined in chapter 4 below.

⁷⁴ John also uses (or has the characters use) OT citations to justify the actions of its characters, even if it endangers them, in 1:23 (Isa. 40:3); 2:17 (Ps 69:9); 12:14-15 (Zech 9:9); 13:18 (Ps 41:9); 15:25 (Ps 35:19 and/or 69:4); 19:28 (Ps 69:21?).

and an example of his teaching (30b, unverifiable).⁷⁵ It is not a winning strategy; he dies after all. Then again, so does Jesus. Both the *Apology* and the Fourth Gospel manage to turn the trial around on their protagonists' accusers, ironically demonstrating *their* guilt while successfully defending the innocence of Socrates and of Jesus respectively.⁷⁶ What Socrates' defense highlights, filled as it is with quotations, is how important words have to be in a trial focused on the effects those words have on others.

We can see the same tendency to call past words as witnesses in other cases of defensive rhetoric. Isocrates, for example, writes a self-defense of his life and character in *Antidosis*, for which he assumes the fiction of a trial in order to make all of the points he wishes to make against his enemies (8). Like Socrates, Isocrates claims that he is charged with making the weaker arguments the stronger and with corrupting the youth. Since the 'charges' relate to the quality of his speech, at three points he quotes directly and at length from past speeches—giving them the proper context and clarifying points after each quotation—to counter the charges (see 59; 66; 73). Prior to the first quotation, Isocrates describes the advantages of quotation in such a trial (53-54, quoted in full at the head of the chapter): "If I were being tried for some criminal acts, then I should not have been able to produce such things for you to see... But since I am charged concerning words, I think I will be in a better position to show you the truth."⁷⁷ Selectively quoting

⁷⁵ The teaching in 30b is otherwise unknown, but similar to *Laws* 631bc; cp. John 14:2.

⁷⁶ This is a well-noted use of the trial motif in John; e.g. see Parsenios, *Rhetoric and Drama*, 67; Bekken, *Lawsuit Motif*. For this line of argument with Plato, see Dougal Blyth, "Socrates' Trial and Conviction of the Jurors in Plato's *Apology*," *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 33/1 (2000): 1-22.

⁷⁷ Isocrates also apologizes to his audience in case they have heard the quoted extracts often, but it would not do to create new speeches to counter charges regarding his old speeches (55). In other words, the dis-

his own orations allows Isocrates to counter the accusations regarding his speech by calling his words as witnesses to his innocence, in the same way that the written statements of proper witnesses are read aloud to the jury in a normal trial.

Direct Internal Quotation in Novelistic Trial Scenes: Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*⁷⁸

The focus on speech, including DIQ, carries into fictional, prose depictions of trial scenes in Greek novelistic literature as well. Trial scenes are an almost necessary trope of ancient novelistic literature.⁷⁹ Furthermore it may be that this literature is not terribly distant from John's Gospel within Greek culture. Jo-Ann Brant, for example, makes the following observation:

The abandonment of a child by a father, tension between the adoptive parents' desires for and authority over the foster child, confusion regarding the child's true identity given telltale signs of noble descent, the play between the hoped-for wedding and the ever present danger of death—these are ingredients of the ancient Greek novel. These are also elements of the Gospel of John.⁸⁰

pute over his words motivates him to present them before commenting on them. The same situation may be in play in John.

⁷⁸ Although the dating of Achilles Tatius' novel is disputed, it was probably written at least a few decades after the Gospel of John, sometime in the middle of the 2nd century. However, the proximity of Tatius to Christian traditions is signaled not only by Christian legends regarding the author in the *Suda*, in which he converts and becomes a bishop, as well as Christian elaborations of his novel where a married Leucippe is barren until she is baptized by a monk (PG 116 col. 94). It also seems that Tatius may have been familiar with Christian practice, namely the Eucharist, which is likely parodied in the 2nd book of *Leucippe and Clitophon* 2.2," *HTR* 107/2 [2014]: 222-40).

⁷⁹ *Leucippe* features two trial scenes (7.7-16; 8.7-15), the latter of which we will examine here. Chariton's *Callirhoe* (1st century) features four trial scenes (1.4-6; 3.4; 5.4-9; 5.10-6.2); Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesian Tale* (2nd century) features one long trial scene (3.12-4.4), as does Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* (2nd or 3rd century; see 2.12-19); and the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus (2nd or 3rd century) features six trial-type scenes (1.9-14, 14-17; 2.8-9; 4.17-21; 8.8-15; 19.9-17, 34-38). Additional trial scenes can be found in Latin prose fiction as well, such as the *Satyricon* of Petronius (1st century; see 107-109) and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius (2nd century; see 10.6-12). For more on the trial scenes, see Sandra Schwartz, "Clitophon the *Moichos*: Achilles Tatius and the Trial Scene in the Greek Novel," *Ancient Narrative* 1 (2001): 93-113.

⁸⁰ "Divine Birth and Apparent Parents: The Plot of the Fourth Gospel," in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative* (ed. R.F. Hock, J.B. Chance, and J. Perkins; SBL Symposium Series 6; Atlanta:

Brant does not trace the similarities to direct influence, as if John deliberately imitates the novels (especially since many of them were written decades or centuries after the Fourth Gospel). Instead, “both Gospel and novel emerge as examples of an anticanonical genre that continually push against the constraints of literary conventions, some of which they share, while drawing from a literary ferment, parts of which they share.”⁸¹ Brant presses the comparison in order to interpret the elements she lists, not as symbols of a cosmic plot of descent and ascent, but as “integral to the development of the plot and to the reception by its reader,” because they are familiar narrative elements.⁸² I do not want to press the comparison any further than the observation that novelistic trial scenes are prose descriptions of forensic procedures embedded in a larger narrative that often incorporate actual courtroom practices and rhetoric:⁸³ adding to the realism of the scene creates a greater dramatic shock when the expectations of a trial are subverted, e.g. the defendant protests against one crime by confessing to a more serious one, or the supposed murder victim suddenly appears in court. The authors and communities behind the Gospel of John may have read some of the earlier novels, or may have had experiences in the courtroom to draw on as trial elements were integrated into the narrative of the gospel.

The trial of Clitophon in the final book of Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon* provides a number of examples of DIQ. The narrative situation is rather complex, but essentially Clitophon has been framed for the murder of his abducted love,

Scholars Press, 1998), 199-217. See also within the same volume, Ronald F. Hock, “Why New Testament Scholars Should Read Ancient Novels,” 121-38.

⁸¹ Brant, “Divine Birth,” 201.

⁸² Brant, “Divine Birth,” 211.

⁸³ See Schwartz, “Clitophon the *Moichos*,” 101 and the secondary literature she discusses.

Leucippe (whose sacrificial death was faked by others), and he has been accused of adultery with Melite, the wife of Thersander. Clitophon, who narrates, thinks he has found sanctuary in the Temple of Artemis and is about to relate the story to the priest:

We were just about to sit down and discuss these things, when Thersander rushed into the sanctuary, bringing some witnesses (μάρτυρας); and he shouted at the priest with a great voice: “I testify (μαρτύρομαι) before these [witnesses] that it is not proper that he should be taken out (ἐξαίρη) of bonds and of death, a man condemned to die (κατεγνωσμένον... ἀποθανεῖν) by law.” (8.1.1)⁸⁴

What is important for us is that Thersander includes an implicit charge against the priest of Artemis, that he has improperly given sanctuary to a convicted man.⁸⁵

Later a proper trial begins to determine the truth of Thersander’s accusations (8.8.1). Thersander initiates the proceedings, making the case that the council had already condemned Clitophon to death and that the verdict should still stand.⁸⁶ He avoids the actual charge since it is demonstrably false: the supposed murder victim (Leucippe) is alive and in the courtroom. Compare the Jews at Jesus’ trial, who initially try to avoid the question altogether when Pilate asks what charge they bring against Jesus (18:30): “If he were not an evil-doer, we would not have handed him over to you.” At one point in *Leucippe*, Thersander even has the previous decision read aloud to the council (8.8.5). Like the function of DIQ that Childs detects in OT narratives, Thersander uses the words of the council to highlight the contradiction between their previous judgment and the

⁸⁴ My translation; Greek text taken from the LCL.

⁸⁵ As Thersander himself says (8.8.9-10), the altars of the goddess are for the unfortunate, not for the convicted. See above, chapter 2 n. 134 for another quotation from Clitophon as narrator, and compare the cases of DIQ by John’s narrator.

⁸⁶ In Clitophon’s earlier trial (7.7-16), Thersander’s speech is only briefly summarized (7.7.1) while the reader is able to hear Clitophon’s defense directly. However, as Clitophon tries to extract himself from the charge of adultery he ends up confessing to the murder of Leucippe in order to be executed and join his love in death. Doing so tends to downplay the adultery and to show how Clitophon’s *words* get him into trouble, setting him up for the second trial.

present state of affairs.⁸⁷ Thersander then turns to the priest to hear what *he* has to say since he sets himself up as a god next to Artemis⁸⁸ by acting against what the council had previously decreed:

“What do you say, O most revered and moderate priest? In which sacred laws is it written to seize from conviction (καταδίκης) and to loose from bonds (τῶν δεσμῶν ἀπολύειν) those who are condemned (κατεγνώσμενους) by the council and magistrates, those who are given over to death and bonds?” (8.8.6)

He continues to focus on the conflict between the asylum given by the priest and the previous decision of the council and the magistrates. Later drawing a contrast with Artemis who has never let loose (λέλυκεν) nor freed (ἤλευθέρωσε) from punishment someone already given over to death, Thersander claims:

“But you free the bound (τοὺς δεθέντας ἐλευθεροῖς), and you let loose the convicted (τοὺς καταδίκους ἀπολύεις).” (8.8.10)

Thersander maintains the image of Clitophon in chains while transitioning to the present tense and the plural to make it appear as if the priest disregards justice wantonly and often.

When the priest quotes Thersander in his response, he will counter the implications that he frees anyone who enters the temple: he *did* let go (aorist verb) *one* condemned man (singular noun). The priest quotes the charges directly three times over the course of his response. First:

⁸⁷ See above, chapter 1 n. 70. In his first trial, paraphrastic DIQ is used to highlight a contradiction between Clitophon’s confession and his present actions (7.9.7): “‘I loved Melite,’ he says, ‘and therefore I killed Leucippe’ [cp. 7.7.5]. How then does he accuse Melite, whom he loved, of murder and now wishes to die for Leucippe, whom he killed?”

⁸⁸ There are interesting echoes of John here—that Jesus makes himself (equal to) God (5:18; 10:33), and that the Jews neither honor him (5:23; 8:49) nor worship him as they should (4:21-24; 9:38). According to Thersander, the priest should go ahead and put himself entirely above humanity (ὅλως ἄνθρωπον σεαυτὸν ἡγοῦ), and be worshipped (προσκυνοῦ) with Artemis since he is snatching away her honor (τιμήν).

“Permit me to speak to you about what I have been charged with. ‘You let loose (ἔλυσας),’ he says, ‘the one condemned to death (τὸν θανάτου κατεγνώσμενον).’” (8.9.7)⁸⁹

In the first case, Thersander complained that Clitophon should not be taken out of (ἐξαιρῇ) chains; in the second and third, he accused him of letting a condemned man loose *from* (ἀπολύειν) those chains. The priest makes no mention of chains, most likely to avoid the image of Clitophon in bonds, allowing him to adopt the verb that Thersander had previously used only in reference to Artemis. He, acting on the goddess’ behalf, has simply freed a condemned man who, as the priest will argue, is innocent and who was principally condemned by Thersander, not the council (8.9.9-10).

“And now he cries repeatedly, ‘You let loose a convicted man who was given over to death (κατάδικον ἔλυσας θανάτῳ παραδοθέντα)’. How, ‘to death (θανάτῳ)’? ‘Convicted (κατάδικον)’ of what?’⁹⁰ Tell me the capital charge! ‘*For murder* he has been condemned (ἐπὶ φόνῳ κατέγνωσται),’ he says. So he murdered? Tell me who it is? She whom he killed and whom you were saying was slain,⁹¹ you see her living! And you would not dare to still accuse him of murder!” (8.9.12-13)

The focus on speech here is intense. The priest still avoids mention of the chains—Clitophon is given over exclusively to death, one that comes rather from Thersander’s malice than the council. According to Tim Whitmarsh, “in a Greek court, a man could be prosecuted for *sycophantia* (‘sycophancy’), i.e. bringing a suit against someone out of

⁸⁹ The priest also indirectly quotes here the charge that he acts as a tyrant (cf. 8.8.8).

⁹⁰ Bers (*Speech in Speech*, 6) acknowledges that a short phrase or single word may reproduce elements of previous speech. Here the retention of their cases argues that “to death” and “convicted” are quoted.

⁹¹ The quotation here is indirect: ἦν ἀπέκτεινε καὶ ἔλεγε ἀνηρῆσθαι.

malicious intent rather than genuine grievance or public interest,” and the priest deflects the charges against himself by suggesting that Thersander is guilty of this crime.⁹²

The priest then focuses neither on the prisoner’s being handed over nor on his own liberation of the prisoner, but on the *conviction to death* by re-quoting these words directly. Only now is the actual charge against Clitophon reintroduced (“for murder”), emphatically at the head of the statement which the priest credits to Thersander himself. In the present context, Thersander has consistently avoided the actual charges because they are demonstrably false, relying instead on the mere fact of conviction. But he was the one who originally called for Clitophon’s death on charges of murder. The priest, by quoting Thersander as saying that Clitophon has been condemned for murder—and quoting him indirectly a moment later as saying that *she* (who is present) has been slain—emphasizes the contradiction between the man’s argument and the truth.

The trial of the priest of Artemis before the council has to do with acts rather than words or teaching, but the war of words over the charges at the beginning of the trial highlights how important it is to establish precisely what is at stake.⁹³ The priest wants to clear himself of the charge that he lets any convict loose who enters the sanctuary, apparently of his own free will. He modifies the charges to reflect that he *has* let loose

⁹² *Leucippe and Clitophon* (trans. Tim Whitmarsh; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 160. Notice that when Thersander speaks, Clitophon is condemned *by the council and magistrates*, a fact that the priest avoids. Instead, prior to the quotations, he suggests that Thersander has assumed every role in the legal process over Clitophon, including that of the chief councilor (8.9.9-10). John uses a similar (although narrative) ploy against the Jews in Jesus’ trial, depicting his conviction more as the will of his accusers at the earthly level and of his Father at the heavenly (cf. 19:11) than the will of Jesus’ ostensible judge, Pilate.

⁹³ For DIQ in other fictional trial scenes, see *Leucippe and Clitophon* 7.9.7; *Callirhoe* 5.7.4, 6-7; *Daphnis and Chloe* 2.16.3. The embedding of speech is deep in *Aethiopica* 1.15-16 as the guilt of Demaeneta is revealed, where she is quoted by the servant Thisbe, who is quoted by Charias, who is quoted by Cnemon. Thisbe, coming to Aristippus to accuse herself of framing his son, quotes herself in 1.16.2 (cp. 1.11.4).

one convict condemned for a crime that he quite obviously could not have committed.⁹⁴

Yet the priest also turns the charges against Thersander so that *he* manipulates the council to act *against the goddess* (through her representative) and to *kill a man* who is innocent of the charges, out of personal malice. To make this case, the priest uses Thersander's own accusations as evidence against him.

Direct Internal Quotation as a Forensic Marker in the Old Testament

Lincoln, in *Truth on Trial*, examines the Fourth Gospel's lawsuit motif in light of the Old Testament, or more specifically, the Septuagint. He views the conflict between Jesus and the Jews as an ongoing covenant lawsuit, particularly modeled on the language and themes of LXX Isaiah 40-55.⁹⁵ Within the trial scenes of deutero-Isaiah, God calls on the idols and the Israelites to speak/testify (41:1, 21-23; 43:9-10, 26; 44:7; 45:21) and it is asserted that God has proclaimed (43:12; 44:8; 45:19-21) while the idols have not (41:26-27), but unfortunately the *content* of God's past speech is rarely recounted.⁹⁶ Prophetic messages fill the scenes, and in that sense portray Isaiah as presently quoting God, but past speech acts are either presumed or at best implied in God's lawsuit against Israel.

⁹⁴ That Clitophon did commit adultery has yet to be addressed and will be taken up later.

⁹⁵ As Lincoln points out (*Truth on Trial*, 38-40 and throughout), these passages share the following pre-occupations with John: testimony, judgment, truth, glory, and "I am" statements (41:10; 45:22; 46:9; 48:12 [2x], 17; 51:12), particularly unpredicated and absolute cases (43:10, 25 [2x]; 45:18; 46:4; 51:12). The first scriptural citation of the gospel is on the lips of a witness quoting Isa 40:3 (John 1:23).

⁹⁶ LXX Isa 44:26-27 has God declare, "I am... the one who says to Jerusalem, 'You will be inhabited' and to the cities of Judea, 'You will be built up'... the one who says to the abyss, 'You will be laid waste'." These seem to be intended or characteristic speech acts. At 49:3, 6, Isaiah does quote something God *said* to him (εἶπέν μοι) rather than something God *says* (λέγει) as in the many instances of, "Thus says the Lord." A saying ascribed to Zion is quoted in 49:14 (cp. imputed in the present tense to Israel, 40:27). The many allusions to the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 31-32) allow the possibility that it provides the content of God's past speech (Thomas A. Keiser, "The Song of Moses a Basis for Isaiah's Prophecy," *VT* 50/4 [2005]: 486-500); however, Isaiah does not have God quote the song directly. The connection to the song is seen in *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael* (Pisha 12), which posits Deut 32:39 as the content of what is "spoken from the mouth of the Lord" in Isa. 40:5.

Lincoln's argument for the influence of Isaiah on John is persuasive, but the covenant lawsuit does not seem to provide an adequate model for John's use of DIQ.

Instead, and perhaps more appropriately, it is in the narrative books where we find closer comparisons to John's forensic use of DIQ.⁹⁷ In one case Solomon sentences Shimei to house arrest in Jerusalem. In particular, he says (3 Kingdoms 2:37), “[if] you cross the winter-flowing Kidron, you will know for certain that you will certainly die (γινώσκων γνώση ὅτι θανάτῳ ἀποθανῇ), your blood will be on your head,’ and the king swore to him that day.” Three years later when Solomon hears that Shimei has left Jerusalem and returned, he asks Shimei (3 Kingdoms 2:42): “Did I not swear to you by the Lord and call you to witness (ἐπεμαρτυράμην) saying, ‘On whatever day you might go out from Jerusalem and go to the right or to the left, you will know for certain that you will certainly die (γινώσκων γνώση ὅτι θανάτῳ ἀποθανῇ)’?” Solomon does not cite prophetic oracles as Isaiah does, only an isolated, paraphrased statement that he made in the past which testifies to the justice (or at least legitimacy) of his current behavior, making it predictable. Which is to say, he has Shimei killed immediately (2:46).

In a similar vein, at one point Jesus warns the Jews of the sentence should they be found guilty of not believing that “I am” (John 8:24): they will die in their sins, just as he said. Perhaps more to the point, the narrator reminds the audience that Caiaphas was the one who said it was better for one man to die for the nation (18:14) as Jesus is being taken to trial, foreshadowing Jesus' death as clearly as Solomon foreshadows Shimei's. The narrative books of Jewish Scripture, embraced by John, use DIQ in various literary

⁹⁷ See above, chapter 1 n. 77 for a catalogue of accusations and defenses using DIQ in Genesis and 1-2 Kings. Here I use the Septuagint as Lincoln does.

settings, as the Fourth Gospel does, but quotations tend to appear more readily in accusations and defenses, just as they do in John.

Direct Internal Quotation as a Forensic Marker in the New Testament

Even outside of the Fourth Gospel, direct quotations appear frequently in forensic settings within the New Testament. Before getting to the narrative texts, an odd case from the epistolary literature should be mentioned. Hans Dieter Betz classifies Paul's letter to the Galatians as an "apologetic letter" because it:

presupposes the real or fictitious situation of the court of law, with jury, accuser, and defendant. In the case of Galatians, the addressees are identical with the jury, with Paul being the defendant, and his opponents the accusers.⁹⁸

Although Betz was subsequently criticized both on the finer points of his rhetorical analysis and even on the attempt to examine the letter in such detail according to rhetorical criteria, it is difficult to argue that there are *no* forensic elements in the rhetoric of Galatians.⁹⁹ These forensic elements are clearest in the opening chapters where Paul

⁹⁸ *Galatians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 24. Betz compares Galatians to the *Antidosis* of Isocrates, *On the Crown* of Demosthenes, and other apologetic works (p. 15).

⁹⁹ For a survey of reactions to Betz's commentary, see D.F. Tolmie, "The Rhetorical Analysis of the Letter to the Galatians: 1995-2005," *Acta Theologica Supplementum* 9 (2007): 1-28. Among the relevant works, Troy Martin ("Apostasy to Paganism: The Rhetorical Stasis of the Galatian Controversy," *JBL* 114/3 [1995]: 437-61) examines the letter in the context of *controversiae*, or issues that may be contested in a court of law, and classifies Galatians as a "pre-trial letter" (p. 460); Kjell Arne Morland (*The Rhetoric of Curse in Galatians: Paul Confronts Another Gospel* [ESEC 5; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2005]) is more flexible in matters of rhetorical *genus*, arguing for deliberative and judicial rhetoric and connecting the anathemas of Gal 1:8-9 formally to the laws in Deut 13:2-18 (pp. 92-95); Robert Hall ("Arguing Like an Apocalypse: Galatians and an Ancient *Topos* Outside the Greco-Roman Rhetorical Tradition," *NTS* 42/3 [1996]: 434-53) connects Galatians instead to apocalyptic argumentation that "revealed God's judgement distinguishing the righteous from the wicked" (p. 436). Betz allowed for a mixed genre in Galatians even while arguing in favor of classical rhetorical models. Joachim Classen (*Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament* [Boston: Brill, 2002], 26-27) is correct to emphasize that Paul was most likely familiar with many forms of argumentation, whether from his Greek education, reading Greek or Hebrew literature, or from his experiences with fellow Jews. The basic point here is not that Paul is beholden to pre-set models of forensic rhetoric, but that Paul is at least partially engaged in a defense in the opening chapters of Galatians, and so might be expected to reach into the appropriate toolbox in order to do so effectively.

mounts a defense of his own status as an apostle and of the gospel he proclaimed. It is in this context that an odd sort of repetition occurs:

Gal 1:8-9: But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you something other than what we preached to you, let that one be cursed. As we have said before (ὥς προειρήκαμεν), and now I say again (καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω), ‘If anyone preaches to you something other than what you received, let that one be cursed!’

The two statements are not identical, and I have no wish to weigh in on which is the more original¹⁰⁰ because, despite the different wording, the curse is still effective! Of greater interest is the formula that connects the two curses. It seems to be doing a sort of double-duty: Paul recognizes that he has only just cited the curse while also indicating that it is something he spoke long ago,¹⁰¹ whether in a previous visit or in a previous letter. The strong connection between the two curses provided by this formula allows for the quick and noticeable paraphrase.¹⁰² The double recitation of the curse gives it special emphasis while the recollection of his past invocation, whenever it was, accuses the Galatians of failing to be watchful against defection from the true gospel. As Paul continues with the defense of his apostleship, he will also quote what he said to Cephas (2:14).¹⁰³ Although

¹⁰⁰ Both Betz (*Galatians*, 54) and J. Louis Martyn (*Galatians* [AB 33A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997], 115) argue that the move from a hypothetical ἐάν + subjunctive to εἰ + indicative represents an adaptation in the later verse, suggesting that the protasis now indicates a present reality. Yet Martyn also argues that the “angel from heaven” in 1:8 has been introduced to counter the angelic reverence of Paul’s current opponents (p. 115). Either citation or both could have been modified to fit Paul’s present argument.

¹⁰¹ Martyn (*Galatians*, 114-15) argues for the former, while Betz (*Galatians*, 54) argues for the latter.

¹⁰² A similar formula occurs in 5:21 after Paul finishes a list of vices, “I forewarn you about such things, just as I forewarned (ἃ προλέγω ὑμῖν καθὼς προεἶπον): ‘Those who do such things will not inherit God’s Kingdom’.” Paul seems to have said something like this before, hence the recollection, but perhaps the absence of a current paraphrase allows a simpler formula than in 1:9. Paul’s earlier statement that he testifies *again* that circumcised men must follow the whole law (5:3) also seems to appeal to a past statement specifically tied to testimony and legal questions.

¹⁰³ Paul quotes his question to Cephas because the latter “was condemned” (κατεγνωσμένος ἦν, 2:11). The verses that follow his quotation (2:15-21), which may (Martyn, *Galatians*, 246) or may not (Betz, *Galat-*

as a letter Galatians does not create a complete, embedded story world to which it is self-referential, the letter repeatedly appeals to past speech acts—quoted directly, sometimes from the shared experience of Paul and the Galatians—as evidence in defense of Paul’s legitimacy as an apostle and of his proclamation of the gospel.¹⁰⁴

We might expect to find phenomena closer to the Fourth Gospel in the other narratives of the New Testament which do create fully realized story worlds. Among them, Revelation would seem at first glance to be a good candidate. While we may no longer agree with tradition that the Fourth Gospel and Revelation come from the same author, the two texts seem to have derived from groups with similar ideologies and theological vocabulary.¹⁰⁵ However, Revelation is told mainly through first-person narration with many sub-narratives embedded throughout, closer to prophetic and other apocalyptic books than to the historical narratives of the OT.¹⁰⁶ Where the Fourth Gospel

ians, 114) be part of the quotation, are full of legal language (δικαίω four times and δικαιοσύνη once; νόμος six times; and also *seeking* [ζητοῦντες] and *finding* [εὐρέθημεν]).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. also Gal 4:6; 1 Thess. 3:4. Closer to the Fourth Gospel, 1 John 2:18 gives a sort of unverifiable quotation of what seems to be a traditional slogan referring to the end-time: “It is the last hour, and just as you heard, ‘Antichrist is coming,’ even now many antichrists have come to be.” Who exactly said this slogan is unclear since the author places the emphasis on its reception by his audience rather than its utterance by a speaker, but the citation only functions rhetorically because *someone* has said this before. Like Paul, the author of 1 John relies on the authority and familiarity of the message rather than the authority of the speaker, perhaps in this case because it is a common teaching.

¹⁰⁵ Among the similarities in terminology are Jesus as the ‘Lamb’, the motif of ‘living water’, and ‘I am’ statements. For a recent survey of scholarly positions on the relationship of the gospel and the Apocalypse, see Ian Boxall (“From Apocalypse of John to the Johannine ‘Apocalypse in Reverse’: Apocalyptic and the Quest for a Relationship,” in *John’s Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic* [ed. C.W. Williams and C. Rowland; London: T&T Clark, 2013], 58-78) with opinions ranging from shared authorship (e.g. Boxall and Grant R. Osborne) to a complete dissimilarity in language, form, style, and content (Ashton).

¹⁰⁶ In this sense it could be considered loaded with unverifiable quotations given by the first-person narrator, John. Such a form of DIQ is common in apocalyptic texts, such as when Enoch recalls visions or heavenly journeys (e.g. *1 Enoch* 14-36, all unverifiable). This is quite a different form of DIQ than is found in the Fourth Gospel, however.

is replete with DIQ, Revelation contains only two cases of imputed speech,¹⁰⁷ one in the epistolary section and one in the narrative:

Rev 3:17: Because you say, “I am rich and I have become rich, and I have need of nothing.”

Rev 18:7: Because in her heart she says,¹⁰⁸ “I sit as a queen, and I am not a widow, and I will not see mourning.”

Like the Gospel of John, Revelation comments on the impact of speech: *because* Babylon claims that she will never see grief, her plagues will come in a day (Rev 18:8). Similarly, *because* Jesus said, “I am God’s Son,” the Jews accuse him of blasphemy (John 10:36). However, although imputed speech is found in John, the gospel seems to be doing something quite different overall from its apocalyptic contemporary in terms of both structure and frequency.

Instead we come closer to the Fourth Gospel when we turn to the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. It is not to say that the similarities between these texts can be reduced to the use of DIQ in juridical contexts. Matthew, which has the most cases of DIQ among the Synoptic Gospels, has a fondness for imputed or at least unverifiable quotation: only two cases are verifiable. Matthew picks up three cases of DIQ from Mark (two

¹⁰⁷ The term “imputed speech” is borrowed from Mark D. Matthews, “The Function of Imputed Speech in the Apocalypse of John,” *CBQ* 74/2 (2012): 319-38. Matthews notes precedents for imputed speech in the Torah (Deut 8:17-18), the prophets (Hos 12:8; Zech 11:5), wisdom literature (Sir 5:1; 11:18-19), and apocalyptic literature (*1 En.* 97:8-10), with the last of these the closest precedent for Revelation. Although each of these cases of imputed speech pertains to wealth, Matthews concludes in a general way that “imputed speech functions as a marker of deviance” (p. 337). This carries through in John.

¹⁰⁸ The introductory phrase in Rev 3:17 reads ὅτι λέγεις ὅτι, while in Rev 18:7 it is ὅτι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς λέγει ὅτι. Unlike the Gospel of John, the author of Revelation does not seem to mind using ὅτι with a speaking verb to introduce direct speech immediately after a causal ὅτι; for more, see the Appendix.

imputed),¹⁰⁹ four from “Q” traditions (two imputed),¹¹⁰ and offers 11 cases of its own (four imputed).¹¹¹ Meanwhile Mark uses DIQ in the context of miracle stories, adding a dramatic and dynamic quality to the scenes that would enhance their perform-ativity.¹¹² John does likewise: each of the Fourth Gospel’s healing miracles includes a command that is quoted directly (4:50; 5:8; 9:7), whether by the narrator (4:53) or by the healed man (5:11; cf. 5:12; 9:11).¹¹³ Matthew and Luke eliminate each of the miracle cases in Mark, despite adapting both stories. Since those in John appear in or attached to material

¹⁰⁹ Matt 15:5 (// Mark 7:11); 26:61 (// Mark 14:58); and 26:75/26:34 (// Mark 14:72/14:30). The only verifiable case that Matthew brings in from Mark is Peter’s recollection of Jesus’ accusation that he would deny Jesus (cf. also Luke 22:61/22:34). John is the only gospel not to handle Peter’s denial using DIQ—it leaves the connection implicit (cf. John 13:38; 18:27)—although it does use DIQ in Peter’s restoration scene (21:15-17), where his triple affirmation of love for Jesus counters his triple denial. There is also the repetitive structure, quite close to DIQ, about Jesus’ ability to forgive sins as evidenced by his healing of the paralytic (Mark 2:1-12 // Matt 9:2-8 // Luke 5:17-26; cf. John 5:1-12 with DIQ).

¹¹⁰ Matt 11:18-19 // Luke 7:33-34 (2 imputed cases); and Matt 16:2-3 // Luke 12:54-55 (2 cases). Matt 3:9 // Luke 3:8 seems to reflect a common saying (cf. John 8:39), but is presented as a supposition. These are the only cases of DIQ assigned to Q by the critical edition, all unverifiable. However, Luke 7:19 is paired with Matt 11:3 (John’s question, “Are you the one to come...?”) but the DIQ that Luke provides in 7:20 as the message is delivered is omitted from the critical edition without argument (“Is Luke 7:20 in Q?”; James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000], 120). The predilection for verifiable DIQ in the Lukan tradition and Matthew’s predilection for unverifiable DIQ means that the answer could go either way.

¹¹¹ These come mainly in two blocks, either prefaced by “you have heard it said” (Matt 5:21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43) or specifically credited to the scribes and Pharisees (Matt 23:16, 18, 30). The former claims provide commentary on the interpretation of laws. Like other imputed speech, the latter claims are cited to underline the deviance, here the hypocrisy, of the presumed speakers. The final case is characterized by Jesus as testimony against themselves (23:31). The rhetorical presupposition is that Jesus cites recognizably traditional positions, even when it is difficult to confirm this with material prior to Matthew.

¹¹² Cf. Mark 5:31/5:30; 9:23/9:22. Mark 3:30/3:22 (“He has Beelzebul/an unclean spirit”; cf. John 7:20; 8:48) forms an inclusio around a discussion regarding Jesus’ ability to perform exorcisms.

¹¹³ The more complex miracle scene with Lazarus also includes a case of DIQ (11:40). Furthermore, the specifically Johannine type miracle scenes wherein Jesus reveals special knowledge to a character within the story occasionally include DIQ (with Nathanael, 1:50/1:48; with the Samaritan woman, 4:17; cf. also 21:23/13:25).

that has been considered the Fourth Gospel's most primitive,¹¹⁴ it is possible that the DIQ represents an early Christian storytelling technique that was refined out of the tradition by the later Synoptics. Nonetheless even in the two Jerusalem healings John adapts the device to serve as testimony, whether from the sick man to the Jews, launching one of the most juridical discourses in the Fourth Gospel (5:19-47),¹¹⁵ or from the blind man to his neighbors, setting off his own trial (9:13-34).

Still many of the cases in the gospels pertain either to testing claims about Jesus' identity or to accusations against him. In the former category, Jesus asks how the scribes say that the Messiah is the son of David (Mark 12:35; cf. Luke 20:41, indirectly).¹¹⁶ Another case provides two quotations of rumors going around about Jesus—that he is John the Baptist, Elijah, or “one of the prophets”—cited once by servants of Herod¹¹⁷ and another time by the disciples.¹¹⁸ In the latter category there is Mark's double citation of the accusation that Jesus “has Beelzebul” (Mark 3:22). The accusation is paraphrased directly (3:30) and immediately after Jesus has declared that blaspheming the *Holy Spirit*

¹¹⁴ Whether as part of Bultmann's or Fortna's “Gospel of Signs” or von Wahlde's “First Edition,” the miracle stories are generally seen as the primitive building blocks on which the discourses are later built.

¹¹⁵ See Myers, “Juridical Rhetoric.”

¹¹⁶ Cf. also Mark 9:11 // Matt 17:10, asked indirectly. Four of Mark's cases of DIQ (and 9:11) involve the scribes, whether Jesus or the narrator is quoting them (3:30/3:22; 7:11-12; 12:35) or they are quoting Jesus (12:32/12:29-31). This may say something about the author of Mark's perception of how the scribes argued. While “the scribes” are absent in John, “the Jews” fill a similar role (see below).

¹¹⁷ Mark 6:14-15 // Matt 14:2 // Luke 9:7-9.

¹¹⁸ Mark 8:27-28 // Matt 16:13-14 (indirect) // Luke 9:18-19. There are variations between each list already in Mark. The first citation is longer in each case, John is described as the Baptizer (ὁ βαπτίζων, Mark 6:14) instead of the Baptist (τὸν βαπτιστήν, Mark 8:28), and Jesus is described as “a prophet *like* one of the prophets” (προφήτης ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν, Mark 6:15), although the last three words are quoted exactly in Mark 8:28. In the first instance (6:14-15) the narrator simply reports what people were saying (in the nominative), while in the second (8:27-28) the disciples quote what they are saying, first indirectly in the accusative then directly in the nominative (εἷς not ἓνα τῶν προφητῶν, cf. Matt 16:14).

(τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) can never be forgiven (3:28-29): “For they said, ‘He has an *unclean* spirit (πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον).’” As in Greek trial literature, Mark turns the accusation against the accusers, evidently without a concern to replicate the speech exactly. Meanwhile Matthew has Jesus’ accusers mock him for his inability to come down from the cross, “for he said, ‘I am God’s Son’” (Matt 27:43; cf. John 10:36 also with unverifiable DIQ).¹¹⁹

Matthew and Luke each contribute a case of verifiable DIQ related to Jesus’ resurrection, although they use it to different ends. In Luke, two young men at the empty tomb tell the women (24:6-7): “Remember (μνήσθητε) when he spoke to you while he was still (ἔτι ὧν) in Galilee,¹²⁰ saying, ‘The Son of Man must be handed over into the hands of sinful men and be crucified, and rise on the third day’.” These words are basically a hodge-podge of Luke 9:22, 44 and 18:31-33, but they act as a confirmation of Jesus’ foreknowledge of his arrest and execution at the hands of *sinful* men, turning the implications of guilt back on his accusers. Meanwhile Matthew seems to have access to a similar tradition, but presents it instead as an accusation against Jesus and his disciples. The chief priests and Pharisees appeal to Pilate for a guard at the tomb because (27:63): “We remember (ἐμνήσθημεν) what that deceiver said while he was alive (ἔτι ζῶν), ‘After three days I will rise again’.” Matthew’s closest antecedent is when Jesus claims oblique-

¹¹⁹ Recall that the chief priests also wish to declare that Jesus said, “I am the Jews’ King” (19:21). *The Acts of Pilate* A 1.1 picks up the quotation from Matthew and John, if indirectly, when the chief priests and scribes accuse Jesus before Pilate: λέγει ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ βασιλέα (cf. A 4.5 with ὅτι εἶπεν in answer to the question, “Why should he die?”).

¹²⁰ Compare the possibly unverifiable case of DIQ in Luke 24:44. Interpreted directly, Jesus says: “These are my words which I said to you while still with you, (ὅτι) ‘Everything written in the Law of Moses and the prophets and psalms concerning me must be fulfilled’.” However, the construction is possibly indirect, and the ὅτι could be causal: “These are my words (i.e. I say these things) *because* everything in the Law of Moses must be fulfilled.” In that case the reference might be to Luke 24:27, but not a quotation.

ly regarding the Son of Man (Matt 20:19), “on the third day he will be raised.”¹²¹ In the story world, the accusation that the disciples will steal the body provides the chief priests with a plausible explanation for the empty tomb. Yet in the narrative, Matthew turns even Jesus’ accusers into witnesses that he predicted his resurrection.¹²²

A last case of imputed speech is important because it occurs during Jesus’ trial.

Here is the judicial context in Mark, in full:

Mark 14:55-59: The chief priests and the whole council were seeking (ἐζήτουν) testimony (μαρτυρίαν) against Jesus to put him to death, but they did not find (ἠὺρισκον). For many were giving false testimony (ἐψευσδομαρτύρουν) against him, and their testimonies (μαρτυρίαι) were not the same. And some who stood up gave false testimony (ἐψευσδομαρτύρουν) against him, saying, “We heard him saying (Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι), ‘*I will destroy this sanctuary that is made with hands, and in three days I will build up another not made with hands*’.” And so neither was their testimony (μαρτυρία) the same.

Matthew presents more or less the same scene (26:59-61) although the saying is abridged and modified (“*I can destroy the temple...*”) and it is not entirely clear that it is *false* testimony.¹²³ Luke meanwhile omits the logion, but it seems to reappear in Acts when Stephen is on trial:

Acts 6:12-14: And they stirred up the people and the elders and the scribes, and coming upon him they seized him and brought him to the Sanhedrin. They set up false witnesses (μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς) who said, “This man does not cease saying words against the holy place and the law. For we have heard him saying (ἀκηκόαμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι), ‘This Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place and he will change the customs that Moses passed on to us’.”

¹²¹ Compare John 12:34 where, in its immediate context, Jesus’ *I* (12:32) is re-quoted as *the Son of Man*.

¹²² It is unclear when precisely they would have heard Jesus say this in the story since the last time Matthew shows Jesus predicting his resurrection, he specifically addresses the Twelve alone (cf. Matt 20:17-19). It could be among the information given to them by the informant Judas Iscariot (cf. Matt 26:14-16) or it may only imply that Jesus made the predictions more than three times.

¹²³ Matthew reproduces Mark’s note that the Sanhedrin sought false testimony nearly verbatim, but it is unclear that the two who come forward (26:60) are two *of those who were lying* or simply two witnesses. Matthew omits both comments on the testimony not matching.

The high priest asks for confirmation of the testimony soon after (cp. Mark 14:60; Acts 7:1). A logion regarding Jesus destroying the temple is quoted in all three Synoptic streams and each mentions false witnesses, suggesting that they are distancing themselves from the claim. Only John ascribes it directly to Jesus (John 2:19), and John alone fails to use (falsely) imputed speech to ‘handle’ the statement. Instead focusing on the timing (“in three days”), John identifies the sanctuary with Jesus’ body (2:21) and turns a prophetic denunciation of the Herodian temple into a passion prediction. Although he imports elements of Jesus’ vocabulary (specifically ναός) the narrator does not use DIQ to reinterpret Jesus’ speech act.¹²⁴ On the one hand, John 2:21 is far from the only point in the Fourth Gospel where Jesus is identified with the temple.¹²⁵ Perhaps the opportunity to link the prediction about the temple to Jesus proved too tempting to completely disown it. On the other, in Jesus’ trial, at least two years and multiple trips to Jerusalem later, threats to the temple, direct or indirect, are never mentioned. Instead he is charged with making himself King of the Jews and Son of God. Perhaps for this reason, no one needs to testify to what Jesus said about destroying the temple, falsely or otherwise.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Two things to note in John’s simplified phrasing of the logion: first, John does not use καταλύω and οικοδομέω but λύω and ἐγείρω, the latter because it can apply to objects or to people, in particular raising from death (cf. John 2:20 with 2:22; also 5:21; 12:1, 9, 17; 21:14); second, John has Jesus command *the Jews* to destroy the sanctuary (i.e. Jesus’ body), a command they will eventually obey.

¹²⁵ For full treatments of this theme, see Mary L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2001), Alan R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus’ Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup 220; London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), and Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006).

¹²⁶ Although Nicodemus’ visit to Jesus soon after may be a sign that Jesus is being investigated, it is not until chapter 5 that the Jews clearly decide to prosecute (ἐδίωκον, 5:16) Jesus, where it is for breaking (ἔλυνεν) the Sabbath rather than the temple, and more to the point for “calling God his father” (5:18).

While Luke provides the fewest cases of DIQ among the gospels, Acts comes the closest to matching the Fourth Gospel with 28.¹²⁷ Furthermore, only eight of these are unverifiable and just one of them is imputed speech, the false testimony against Stephen (6:14). Unlike the Fourth Gospel, Acts groups most of its cases of DIQ in a few retellings of entire stories (the conversion of Cornelius, four cases; the call of Paul [twice], 15 cases). This draws Acts closer to Genesis than to John (see esp. Genesis 24; 44).¹²⁸ However it leaves nine isolated cases like we see in John, and there are other similarities as well. One is that thematic clusters dominate the statements that are quoted in Acts, one related to baptism and the other to the Gentile mission. Although John's material is more diverse, below (chapter 5) we will examine the gospel's thematic cluster regarding Jesus' cosmological movements into and out of the world. The second is that most of the statements in Acts are quoted either in explicit trial settings or at least in the defense of certain courses of action.

Given our present focus on trial material, let us examine the cases in the long trial narrative with which Acts concludes. Even here some cases occur in isolation. Paul is brought before the Sanhedrin for inciting a riot due to the misperception that he teaches against the temple and the law, and that he has brought a Gentile into the temple (cf.

¹²⁷ I have omitted (since John does not feature them) prophetic statements such as Acts 21:11 ("Thus says the Holy Spirit, 'The man whose belt this is...'", although it may be viewed as an unverifiable quotation.

¹²⁸ Given the visionary nature of the stories retold by Peter and Paul in the first person, it also draws Acts closer to the apocalyptic literature. Although unlike Acts these latter are almost always unverifiable, see the visionary experience in the temple told by Paul for the first time in Acts 22:17-21.

21:28).¹²⁹ He draws attention to the judicial setting in his first piece of testimony regarding his controversial teaching:

Acts 23:6: When Paul knew that one part was Sadducees and the other was Pharisees, he cried out to the Sanhedrin, “Brothers, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees. I am also on trial concerning the hope of the resurrection of the dead (περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν κρίνομαι).”

Even a sympathetic reader of Acts would admit that this is hardly the whole story, but the ploy works: a fight breaks out between the Pharisees and the Sadducees and Paul is eventually removed to Roman custody. Shortly thereafter Paul is tried before Felix, and again offers a defense:¹³⁰

Acts 24:18-21: “There were some Jews from Asia who should appear before you and make an accusation if they have anything against me. Or let these men themselves say what unrighteousness they found when I stood before the Sanhedrin other than this one statement, which I cried out while standing among them: ‘I am on trial before you today concerning the resurrection of the dead’ (περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι σήμερον ἐφ’ ὑμῶν).”¹³¹

Paul sounds as if he belongs in the courtroom, at least as Acts depicts him. It is a good thing: he has been on trial for several chapters, and his trials will continue for a couple more. After the riot in Jerusalem initially broke out, for example, Paul delivered a defense (ἀπολογία, 22:1) to his own people in which he retold the story of his call for the first time, including ten cases of DIQ.

Paul’s defense is not entirely successful and he wallows in prison for two years, long enough for Judea to change governors. When the new governor, Festus, approaches

¹²⁹ The judicial nature of this hearing is also signaled by Paul’s outburst after he is struck for insulting the High Priest (23:3): “And you, do you sit judging me according to the law (κρίνων με κατὰ τὸν νόμον), yet violating the law (παρανομῶν) you command me to be struck?” Cp. John 18:22-23.

¹³⁰ When he begins his speech (24:11), Paul refers to Felix as the judge (κριτήν) and declares that he will make his defense (ἀπολογοῦμαι).

¹³¹ Note the several modifications that Paul makes.

Agrippa about the matter because the chief priests and elders of the Jews have asked for a sentence against Paul, Festus claims, in a case of unverifiable DIQ:

Acts 25:16: "...to whom I replied, 'It is not the custom with Romans to give up any person before the accused (ὁ κατηγορούμενος) has the opportunity to face the accusers (τοὺς κατηγοροῦντες), and he receives a defense (ἀπολογία) concerning the charge (τοῦ ἐγκλήματος)'."

When Paul is granted this defense (see ἀπολογέομαι in 26:1, 2, 24), he recalls the story of his call a second time, including five additional cases of DIQ. Including the false witness against Stephen, this means that 19 of the 28 cases of DIQ are spoken in explicit trial settings. It should also be pointed out that Peter narrates his experiences leading to the conversion of Cornelius only after members of the circumcision party *contend* (using a verb derivative of judgment, διεκρίνοντο) with him after hearing that Gentiles had accepted the word of God (11:1-2), which would add four more cases to the count.

There is a running theme throughout the defenses of Peter and Paul: they are not only defending themselves but also the Gentile mission. Peter's conversion of the Gentile Cornelius receives special emphasis as the story is told (10:1-33) and then retold (11:1-18),¹³² while Paul's call to the Gentiles is retold on two separate occasions. By the third time we hear it, Jesus tells Paul directly (rather than telling Ananias, cf. 9:15): "I will rescue you from your people and from the Gentiles, *to whom I am sending you* to open their eyes" (26:17-18). Acts is generally concerned to explain and to justify the expansion of Christianity from a sort of intra-Jewish phenomenon into the Gentile world.¹³³ Direct

¹³² The retelling begins before chapter 11, as Cornelius quotes the revelation he received to find Peter (cf. 10:30-32/10:3-6). When Peter retells the story himself, he quotes this message for a third time (11:13-14).

¹³³ Another unverifiable case of DIQ occurs in Acts 27:24 after Paul has been shipwrecked. Here he claims that an angel told him the night before not to be afraid because Paul would have to stand before the emperor, and thus will successfully arrive in the Gentile capital.

internal quotation allows Acts to revisit this theme, underlining what it sees as two important steps in that process: the conversion of a Gentile centurion and the call of the apostle to the Gentiles.

There is apparently another theme with which Acts is concerned since it recurs several times: Christian baptism. One case of DIQ related to this motif is admittedly questionable (Acts 1:4-5):¹³⁴ it is marked as something the disciples have *heard* rather than what someone said, and it seems to quote something John the Baptist said rather than Jesus (cf. Luke 3:16).¹³⁵ This same statement narrated in Luke, however, is later quoted directly by Paul, and Jesus' possibly indirect quotation from Acts 1:4-5 is then quoted directly by Peter!

Luke 3:16: John answered, saying to all, "I baptize you with water, but one who is stronger than me is coming, of whom I am not fit (ικανός) to untie the strap of his sandals: he will baptize you with Holy Spirit and fire."

Acts 1:4-5: He instructed them not to leave Jerusalem, but to await the Father's promise, "Which you heard from me,¹³⁶ 'John baptized with water but you will be baptized with Holy Spirit after not many days'."

Acts 11:16: "I [Peter] remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, 'John baptized with water but you will be baptized with Holy Spirit'."

Acts 13:25: "When John was completing the course, he said, 'Whom do you suppose me to be? I am not he [cp. John 1:20-21; 3:28], but behold, he is coming after me of whom I am not worthy (ἄξιος) to untie the sandal of his feet'."¹³⁷

¹³⁴ On Acts 1:4-5 as a direct quote, see Henry J. Cadbury, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts IV. On Direct Quotation, with Some Uses of ὅτι and εἰ," *JBL* 48 (1929): 412-25, esp. 415.

¹³⁵ In John, there are ten cases where something that was heard is quoted, often with a transition from aorist to present (4:1, 47; 11:20; 12:12, 34) that could mark direct or indirect quotations since the tense of the original statement is generally kept even in indirect quotations (see Cadbury, "Lexical Notes," 413-14). All of these are completing (as are three other cases, 4:42; 9:32, 35) but in two instances (11:6; 21:7), what is heard has only just been spoken in identical wording (cf. 11:4, "he is sick"; 21:7, "it is the Lord") so that a sort of DIQ is formed with focus on the hearer rather than the speaker.

¹³⁶ Note the awkward transition from third person (*he* instructed *them*, παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς) to first and second person (*you* heard from *me*, ἠκούσατέ μου).

It seems that this promise was especially important to the author of Acts, perhaps because he was aware of people who had experienced only John's baptism (cf. 18:25). Whether Acts was written by the same author as Luke or not,¹³⁸ the later document has quoted a line from the earlier text to bolster its position on Christian baptism. Peter quotes the Baptist to justify the Gentile mission, while Paul (in Acts) cites him in a synagogue to justify his messianic claims regarding Jesus.

The Gospel of John acts more like Paul in its use of John the Baptist, with the Baptist helping to justify claims regarding Jesus before a Jewish audience. But the Fourth Gospel couches these citations much more strongly in the language of testimony, foreshadowing the investigation of Jesus with a similar investigation of John and calling the Baptist as a witness in its defense of Jesus. The Baptist's role as a witness is well-noted¹³⁹ and well-signaled in the text both when he is introduced (1:6-8)¹⁴⁰ and when he first speaks:¹⁴¹

¹³⁷ Note that Paul adds phrases, including the rhetorical question and its answer, and re-words elements in the quoted phrase. In fact, Paul's quotation replaces Luke's 'fit' (ἱκανός) with 'worthy' (ἄξιος), as in John's version of the saying (1:27). Note also the possible indirect quotation of the Baptist by Paul in Acts 19:4. Shellard (*New Light on Luke*, 215-18) notes further similarities between John 1:27 and Acts 13:25—adding the singular "sandal," the elimination of ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, and the addition of οὐκ εἰμι ἐγώ to the list—in support of her theory that the Lukan tradition used John as a source. In her view, presenting the material twice allows Luke to reconcile variant traditions (Markan and Johannine).

¹³⁸ That the two texts have the same author is the traditional and still majority position. However for a counterargument, see Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence* (SNTS 145; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

¹³⁹ E.g. Moloney, *John*, 43 ("He is never presented as a messianic forerunner. His only function is to witness to Jesus"); or Keener, *John*, 1:391 ("As in the rest of the Gospel, John here functions primarily or solely as a witness to Jesus").

¹⁴⁰ "He came as a *witness*, so that he might *testify*... he was not the light, but in order that he might *testify* concerning the light."

¹⁴¹ In chapter 4 below, we will examine in more detail how John uses paraphrase through 1:15/1:30/1:27 to introduce and amplify the notion that Jesus is superior to the Baptist because of his preexistence.

John 1:15: John testifies (μαρτυρεῖ) about him and has cried out, saying, “This was whom I said, ‘The one who comes after me is ahead of me, because he was before me’.”

It may seem odd to have the Baptist quote his past speech before the story even begins, but it accomplishes at least two things: it introduces the *content* of his testimony, perhaps in summary form,¹⁴² and it establishes that his testimony is *a matter of record* that can be recalled in the present (note the tense of “testify”).

The narrator segues smoothly out of the prologue into the opening scene which begins with an interrogation regarding the Baptist’s identity:

John 1:19: And this is John’s testimony (μαρτυρία), when the Jews from Jerusalem sent priests and Levites to him to ask (ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν)¹⁴³ him, “Who are you?”

What follows over the Baptist’s next two days of testimony is a cluster of direct quotations, of himself and of divine revelations, including even his choice of scriptural citation:

John 1:23: He said, “I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, ‘Make straight the way of the Lord,’ just as Isaiah the prophet said.”¹⁴⁴

John 1:30: “This is the one about whom I said, ‘A man comes after me who is ahead of me, because he was before me’.”

¹⁴² So Abbott, *Grammar*, 36.

¹⁴³ ἐρωτάω often has an investigative connotation in the NT (cf. Matt 16:11; 19:17?; 21:24; Luke 19:31; 20:3; 22:68; 23:3), and ἐπερωτάω more so (Matt 12:10; 22:23, 35, 41, 46; 27:11; Mark 7:5; 8:27, 29; 9:21?; 10:2; 11:29; 12:18, 28, 34; 14:60, 61; 15:2, 4, 44; Luke 3:14; 6:9; 9:18; 18:18; 20:21, 27, 40; 22:64; 23:6, 9). ἐρωτάω can mean simply to ask (cf. John 9:2; 16:5, 19, 30), although even these cases can carry some ambiguity, but it is often used in a forensic sense (cf. John 1:21, 25; 5:12; 9:15, 19, 21; 18:21 [2x]; also 9:23; 18:7 with ἐπερωτάω).

¹⁴⁴ On the similarity of John’s scriptural citations to its character citations, see chapter 4 below. My point here is that the Baptist’s (paraphrased) citation of Isaiah is itself a self-citation of the voice crying in the wilderness; cf. also John 10:34 (Ps 82:6): “I said, ‘You are gods’.”

John 1:33: “And I did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize in water, that one told me, ‘The one upon whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining upon him, he is the one who baptizes in Holy Spirit’.”

John 1:34: “And I have seen and I have testified (μεμαρτύρηκα), ‘This is the Son of God’.”

Presenting the material in this way has the same advantage as the testimony given in the prologue: not only did the Baptist say these things, *he can be quoted as saying them*. This is underlined still more when we last see the Baptist and he quotes himself, referencing the earlier scene:

John 3:28: “*You yourselves testify about me* (αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε),¹⁴⁵ that I said, ‘I am not the Christ,’ but ‘I am sent ahead of him’.”

Later Jesus will add to this characterization of John, listing him among other witnesses while explicitly referencing the opening scene of the gospel (5:33-36).¹⁴⁶

The Baptist in the Fourth Gospel is not distracted by calls to repentance and broods of vipers. Instead he is used repeatedly and only to testify to the identity of Jesus and to his own subordination.¹⁴⁷ Even in the final mention of the Baptist we do not find any recollection of his death or of his status among the prophets, only that he performed no signs and that everything the Baptist said about Jesus was true (10:42). The narrow redundancy of John’s presentation of the Baptist keeps the focus on his testimony, sharpening the Baptist’s characterization and only using him to make the ‘case’ for Jesus.

¹⁴⁵ Notice not only the emphatic *you* (ὑμεῖς), but the doubly emphatic addition of αὐτοί. When John’s disciples approach him, they identify Jesus, not as “the one you baptized” or even “the one who comes after you,” but as “the one to whom you have testified” (ὁ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, 3:26).

¹⁴⁶ The priests and Levites are sent to John (ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν, 1:19) on the first day, and Pharisees [are] sent (ἀπεσταλμένοι, 1:24) on the second day. Later Jesus begins (5:33), “You sent to John (ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην), and he has testified (μεμαρτύρηκεν) to the truth.”

¹⁴⁷ Whether the authors of John were in some sort of conflict with the followers of the Baptist is not my concern, but presenting the Baptist’s testimony in this way would counter pro-Baptist claims against Jesus.

Thematically in terms of content, John establishes Jesus' superiority to the Baptist. In terms of form, John establishes and reinforces the Baptist's character as a witness.

Direct Internal Quotation as a Device in the Trial Motif of the Fourth Gospel

Admitting that John does not use DIQ only in service to the trial motif—it can be used, for example, pedagogically—if the trial motif *is* a strong motivator to use the device then we would expect it to show up especially in scenes of contention, preferably during the several trial-type scenes of the Fourth Gospel. We have already seen that Jesus' first witness, the Baptist, quotes extensively (six separate quotations) in the few brief scenes he has: the first while he is being investigated by the Jerusalem Jews (1:19-34), and the second while settling a dispute (ζήτησις)¹⁴⁸ between his disciples and a Jew (3:25-30). Jesus quotes himself to Nicodemus (3:7), who has possibly come to investigate him as a ruler of the Jews (3:1), shortly before explaining that “what we have seen we testify (μαρτυροῦμεν), and you do not receive our testimony (μαρτυρίαν)” (3:11). Jesus testifies (ἐμαρτύρησεν) that a prophet has no honor in his homeland (4:44) after leaving Jerusalem. When next he returns to the city the Jews will interrogate the man he has healed, prompting the man to testify to what Jesus told him (5:10-11).¹⁴⁹ The Jews then question (ἠρώτησαν) him about Jesus, quoting the sick man directly (5:12).¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ However Parsenios (*Rhetoric and Drama*, 50-51 n. 10) labels John's only uses of the noun, ζήτησις, an “inquiry” rather than an investigation (cf. also 16:19), adding that here it “is in keeping with the use of the word in philosophical contexts.”

¹⁴⁹ Indeed they are initially only interested in the man, pointing out that it is unlawful (οὐκ ἔξεστίν) for him to carry the bed: “This denunciation by ‘the Jews’ constitutes a formal accusation against the healed man and signals the beginning of a juridicial controversy” (Asiedu-Peprah, *Sabbath Conflicts*, 68). The man replies by testifying against Jesus. This is not the position taken by *Acts of Pilate* 6.1 (see chapter 4 below).

¹⁵⁰ The monologue that follows (5:19-47) has many forensic features (see Myers, “Juridicial Rhetoric”).

The long series of episodes set at Tabernacles and Dedication (7:14-10:39) can be viewed as a long, semi-coherent investigatory trial narrative.¹⁵¹ In the disputes of chapters seven and eight where Jesus' words serve as witnesses in his defense,¹⁵² the Jews quote him four times (7:36; 8:22, 33, 52). They even quote their own accusations against Jesus and comment on the goodness of these claims (8:48). Meanwhile Jesus quotes himself on one occasion, reversing the charges and insisting that *they* will die in their wrongdoings (8:24). Finally, in the dispute over their respective heritage and which side is more in line with God's will, Jesus quotes the Jews regarding his Father, that "He is our God" (8:54; cp. 8:41), to support his accusation that his opponents are liars who act like their real "father," the Devil (8:44). The closely connected Dedication scene is much shorter,¹⁵³ but even here Jesus quotes both the accusation against him, that he blasphemes, and the supposed speech act that has drawn the accusation, that he is God's Son (10:36).

The hearing of the man born blind is couched within these stories. Here the man testifies to his neighbors what Jesus commanded him (9:11), which leads to his interrogation before the Pharisees who ask him, "What do you *say* about him?" (9:17). Suddenly "the Jews" intrude into the scene to question (ἠρώτησαν) his parents since, as they assure us, the parents say, "He was born blind" (9:18-19). Afraid, the man's parents

¹⁵¹ Neyrey, "Trials (Forensic)," 107. Parsenios (*Rhetoric and Drama*, 81), building on Neyrey's work, summarizes the similarities between chapter 7 and Jesus' passion narrative and actual trial before Pilate, to which I add elements from chapter 8: 1) (attempts at) arrest (7:32, 44-46; 8:20; 18:1-11), 2) charges leveled against Jesus (7:12, 21-23, 41, 47; 8:48, 52; 19:7), 3) people assuming the role of judge over Jesus (7:13, 15, 32, 45-52; 8:13, 19, 53; Pilate in the trial), 4) a *cognitio* by the presumed and actual judges (7:14-15, 28-29; 8:19-20, 25-26; 18:33-38; 19:8-11), 5) a verdict (the decision to arrest him in 7:30, 44 indicates guilt, as does the attempt to stone him, 8:59; in the trial, Jesus is found innocent three times by Pilate [18:38; 19:4, 6], who tries to release him [19:12] but in the end hands him over for crucifixion [19:16]).

¹⁵² On the use of the four witnesses in the structure of the Fourth Gospel, see above, chapter 1 n. 5.

¹⁵³ Brown ("Incidents," 150) traces how virtually the same dialogue appears in John's Dedication scene as in his actual trial scenes before Caiaphas in the Synoptics; see chapter 4 below.

request that they interrogate (ἐρωτήσατε) their son instead, since he is old enough to be a legal witness (9:21).¹⁵⁴ The narrator quotes them directly to explain that it was their fear that drove them to silence (9:22-23). After he is called back and asked how Jesus healed him, the man draws attention to the importance of his testimony (9:27): “I told you already and you did not listen. Why do you want to hear it again?” When the blind man is cast out, Jesus finds him and identifies the Son of Man as “the one speaking with you” (9:37).¹⁵⁵ Jesus then declares that he came into the world for judgment (κρίμα), i.e. *he* and not the Jewish authorities is judge, so that those who see may become blind (9:39). The nearby Pharisees rightly recognize that Jesus has turned the accusations around on them and ask (9:40), “We are not also blind, are we?” They do not expect that Jesus will go so far as to make this claim. Jesus responds by quoting them (9:41): “If you were blind, you would not have sin. But now that you say, ‘We see’ (βλέπομεν), your sin remains.” His paraphrase highlights that they are precisely those who will be made blind (i.e. οἱ βλέποντες) while baldly stating that he and the man are not sinners (cf. 9:16, 24, 34), *they are*. All told this long set of pre-trial narratives from John 7-10 accounts for a dozen more cases of DIQ.

It is important to remember that the gospel itself is presented as the testimony of the Beloved Disciple (cf. 21:24). This allows the narrator to relate the positive testimony of the blind man’s parents within the trial (that he was born blind and now sees) while explaining away their lack of further testimony before the Pharisees and Jewish author-

¹⁵⁴ Brown, *John*, 1:374.

¹⁵⁵ The self-identification here is in the third person (ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σοῦ ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν), quite similar to a claim Jesus made to the Samaritan woman with regard to the Messiah (ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ λαλῶν σοι, 4:26).

ities: from the perspective of their son's judges any more would amount to a confession (ὁμολογήσει) that Jesus is the Christ, and would lead to their expulsion from the synagogue (9:22). The reasons for the Baptist's arrest are never given in the Fourth Gospel, although it is mentioned (3:24). Yet in his testimony the Baptist has very strongly *confessed* (ὡμολόγησεν, 2x) and *did not deny* (οὐκ ἡρνήσατο, 1:20; recalled as testimony at 3:28) that *he* is not the Christ but that Jesus, effectively, is. Does John wish to imply that the Baptist's confession had something to do with his arrest? Even some of the rulers believed in Jesus, yet did not confess (οὐχ ὡμολόγουν) because of the Pharisees (12:42).

While much of the scholarly focus regarding the threat to expel confessors of Jesus as the Christ is placed on its unlikely historicity in Jesus' lifetime or on what it tells us about the author's community,¹⁵⁶ its role in its narrative context should not be overlooked. The narrator makes a rhetorical move by implying that the absence of testimony from the parents is due to intimidation of the witnesses by the Jews. We see similar moves in orations. Isaeus doubts that the victims of his opponent will testify against him because they fear him (8.42). Demosthenes accuses Theocrines of threatening and bribing witnesses not to testify (58.7).¹⁵⁷ Conversely, Lysias uses the *absence* of witnesses for his opponent, Nicomachus, against him, contrasting Nicomachus' lack of witnesses with the many that Lysias himself has brought forward (7.34-43). Although Lysias offered his own servants as witnesses, Nicomachus indicates that they could not be trusted even under torture, implying that they would be intimidated by their master—a charge that

¹⁵⁶ Especially J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (3rd ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 46-66, although he acknowledges (pp. 42-43) the dramatic role the verse plays in having the narrator address the audience directly during the "drama" of John 9.

¹⁵⁷ Elsewhere Demosthenes uses threats to persuade witnesses to testify (19.157). For more cases, see Alfred P. Dorjahn, "Intimidation in Athenian Courts," *Classical Philology* 32/4 (1937): 341-48.

Lysias takes time to defend against (7.35). In the Fourth Gospel, the absence of traditional witnesses in Jesus' defense is used against him (John 8:13; cp. 5:31).¹⁵⁸ While theologically supportive of the non-traditional witnesses (the Father, his works, etc.) the narrator, like these orators, may be presenting the case that traditional witnesses were not forthcoming because Jesus' opponents tampered with the legal process.

The gospel's role as testimony also allows the narrator to explain why the high priest Caiaphas decisively condemns Jesus to death in a formal hearing of the Sanhedrin, rephrasing his advice in a way that acknowledges a possible historical reality (a mass recognition of Jesus as king in Jerusalem at Passover could well have drawn a violent overreaction from Pilate and the Romans) while turning it to Jesus' advantage: Jesus did not die because he was guilty or because the Sanhedrin had power over him, but because it was part of God's salvific plan (11:46-53). Yet as Nicodemus points out in a perhaps less formal hearing of the chief priests and Pharisees (7:45-52), "our law does not judge a person unless it hears from him first" (7:51).¹⁵⁹ Yet *before* Jesus is taken to Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin for trial (cf. 18:24), the narrator recalls who Caiaphas is by quoting what

¹⁵⁸ Whether completely independent or not, later Talmudic tradition (*Sanh.* 43a) claims that an announcer was sent out for 40 days looking for someone to testify on Jesus' behalf and none could be found.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Exod 23:1; Deut 1:16; 17:4; 19:16-17; and Josephus, *J.W.* 1.209. This was also evidently an issue in Roman law. Two factors may be important in the presentation of the Jews in John's passion narrative: first, no trial before Caiaphas is narrated or even noted, only that Jesus was sent bound to Caiaphas (18:24) and then was taken to Pilate (18:28). As Parsenios emphasizes, in John the only actual trial is a Roman trial. Second, also in 18:28, the narrator notes that the Jews (cf. 18:31) did not enter the praetorium to avoid defilement. This means that Jesus *never faces his accusers* during the actual, legally binding trial. The right to face accusers was apparently an issue for Christ-followers around the time that John was written: Acts 25:16 (quoted above) gives an assertion of the right to confront accusers in the mouth of a Roman governor, and the Emperor Trajan (10.97) replies to a question regarding the prosecution of Christians from Pliny the Younger (10.96) with a reminder that the right to confrontation should be respected—anonymous accusations are both dangerous and not in keeping with the spirit of the age (*Nam et pessimi exempli nec nostri saeculi est*). Whatever theological or literary meaning lies behind the depiction of Pilate darting back and forth between the chief priests and Jesus, does John also intend to depict the chief priests as skirting Roman legal practice—and Pilate, as judge, allowing it?

he had *already* advised the Sanhedrin: that it is better to have one man die for the people (18:14), advice that led to Jesus' death sentence long before the Sanhedrin could hear his defense (11:53). Therefore the high priest's statement is also evidence against him that he and the Sanhedrin practice *sycophantia* rather than the law.

There is other testimony in the passion narrative. Jesus' admission that he is in fact Jesus the Nazorean (18:5) is quoted twice (18:6, 8). Perhaps John means to deflect accusations that Jesus hid prior to his arrest, fleeing from justice.¹⁶⁰ Jesus' plea for the lives of his disciples is supported by the (probably unverifiable) citation of a previous statement: "I did not lose any of those that you have given me" (18:9).¹⁶¹ Finally the chief priests request that Pilate alter the *titulus* attached to the cross from "Jesus the Nazorean, King of the Jews" (19:19) to a piece of incriminating testimony supporting the charge that Jesus is a royal pretender: "He said, 'I am the Jews' King'" (19:21).¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ Origen asks regarding this scene, "For if he did not want to suffer, would he have said again, 'I am'?" (*Comm. Io.* 11.208). Elsewhere (*Ag. Cels.* 2.9; cp. also 1.61), Origen reports the accusations that Jesus was shamefully taken while hiding (κρυπτόμενος) and fleeing (διαδιδράσκων). Having Jesus go to a place that Judas knew (John 18:2) and boldly declare himself when he was aware of Judas' betrayal (cf. using DIQ in 13:11) would all work to counter such claims. See Bickerman, "Utilitas Crucis," 2:766, who cites the passage from Origen, on Jesus' arrest scene in John: "Ancient readers, both pagan and Christian, who were familiar with the ways of the Roman administration understood perfectly the juridical significance of these brief passages."

¹⁶¹ Most often, John 6:39; 10:28; and John 17:12 are cited as precedents; see chapter 1 and Moloney, *John*, 483; Keener, *John*, 2:1082; Brown, *John*, 2:811. They are all variations on a theme, although what is given (something he can raise on the last day; eternal life; the name), to whom it is given (the disciples or Jesus), and what exactly ἀπόλλυμι refers to (loss? immediate death? eschatological destruction?) varies from paraphrase to paraphrase. Whatever the case, the referents fulfill both Scripture (17:12) and Jesus' word (18:9). I agree with von Wahlde that "Verbal identity is not to be demanded" if these verses are in mind (*John*, 2:747), although I disagree with his reasoning ("since the statement in 18:9 is not said to be an actual quotation"). Its introduction (ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν, lacking ὅτι) and its switch from the third person (*he* said) to the first ("you gave *me*... *I* lost") seem to mark it heavily as a direct quotation, whether paraphrased or unverifiable.

¹⁶² *Acts of Pilate* 10.1 presents the *titulus* in indirect quotation, but *of the Jews* who had mockingly called out, "You are the King of the Jews, save yourself!" (cp. Luke 23:37-38): "Pilate called the title to be written, inscribed in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, just as the Jews said, this is the King of the Jews."

Twenty-eight internal quotations occur in scenes tied to the trial motif in the Gospel of John, if not in actual trial scenes. Others could probably be added, such as the ones that appear in Jesus' debate with crowds in John 6,¹⁶³ or those used to defend Jesus against the accusation that he was not aware one of his disciples would hand him over to the authorities (13:11; 21:20).

As an internally referential device, DIQ may usefully recall words as testimony or as an educational tool. That is, the teacher may recall his own words or the words of his students without the need for an author to record the original speech act.¹⁶⁴ At the story level, what is important for the rhetorical effect of this sort of self-citation is that the quotation is internal to the *story*—that the students recall the teaching, not necessarily that the gospel's audience does. The same goes for common sayings (see chapter 4 below): the listeners only need to recognize it as a common sentiment made by people like them, at least enough not to object. Often in trial orations only the quotation is given. Sometimes the litigant quotes from his opponent's speech, which he has no reason to publish later along with his own but from which the jury could confirm or deny the quotation (i.e. the statement is internal to their shared story, quite possibly a fictional story in which the oration was actually delivered if it never was in real life). Other times the orator and witnesses refer to events outside of the courtroom but which support the present case. As readers of the Beloved Disciple's written testimony (21:24) that Jesus is the Messiah and Son of God (20:31), we never learn *when* exactly the Baptist had his revelations from God about Jesus or when he previously testified that Jesus is the Son of

¹⁶³ On the forensic qualities of John 6, see Borgen, "Words and Works of Jesus."

¹⁶⁴ Plato's Socrates is fond of this. See John 11:40; 14:2.

God (1:30-34). We never learn *when* exactly Jesus testified that a prophet has no honor in his homeland (4:44), or when he accused the people of Galilee, “You have seen me and you have not believed” (6:36).¹⁶⁵ We simply have to trust that Jesus is a reliable witness, and that the accusations against his opponents are true. His repeatedly reliable quotations throughout the gospel allow the reader to trust him.

The only scene dense with internal quotations outside of forensic material occurs in chapter 4 in Samaria. The woman questions why Jesus would ask her for a drink since she is a Samaritan and he is a Jew (4:7-8), and he, like other Jews in John, immediately uses a quotation to answer her question—she should not focus on her recognition that he is a Jew but on the gift of God and who specifically says to her, “Give me a drink” (4:10).¹⁶⁶ By the end of the encounter, the other Samaritans believe her claims that he could be the Christ at least enough to go check him out because of her testimony (μαρτυρούσης, 4:39). Jesus does not deny that he is a Jew—after all, salvation is from the Jews (4:22)—but through their conversations and the revelation of special knowledge, Jesus has successfully called her as a witness that this particular Jew is also the Christ (4:25-26, 29) and Savior of the World (4:42).

¹⁶⁵ On John 4:44, see chapter 4 below. On the difficulty of 6:36, Borgen (“Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6,” *ZNW* 54 [1963]: 232-40) translates it as, “But I have said, ‘[to] you,’ (cf. 6:32) because (ὅτι), though you have seen, still you do not believe.” Yet the form, εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι, is a common way of introducing embedded speech in John (cf. 1:50; 6:65; 8:24; 9:11; 11:40; 13:33; 14:2; 18:8) and Borgen’s alternative translation only reflects his assumption that John’s narrative should be complete in its self-referentiality.

¹⁶⁶ It is unlikely that John imagines Jesus to be culturally Judean, so his accent is probably Galilean. Ἰουδαῖος is likely a religious designation. Jesus uses DIQ to enact a revelation of special knowledge (4:17); notice how Jesus frames the quotation: “You have rightly said, ‘A husband I do not have’ . . . this you have said truly.” Two more common sayings are quoted: the woman quotes a common saying that she ascribes to Jews generally (ὑμεῖς λέγετε), again in contrast to Samaritan beliefs (4:20); and Jesus quotes what appears to be a proverbial agricultural saying to the disciples, ascribing it to them directly (4:35).

The focus in these scenes, on how Jesus does or does not fit into the character of “the Jews” as perceived by Samaritans, draws attention to how “the Jews” are presented in the Fourth Gospel generally. While “the Jews” in John have been the subject of substantial research and comment in the field, it is nonetheless difficult to parse out the particulars of their group character especially as distinct from other groups like the rulers, chief priests, and Pharisees.¹⁶⁷ John does not consistently differentiate between these groups, and this is true with certain cases of DIQ. In the meeting of the Sanhedrin, Caiaphas tells *the chief priests and Pharisees* (cf. 11:47) that it is better for one man to die. When the scene is recalled by the narrator, Caiaphas is said to have given this advice to *the Jews* (18:14). Of course, the chief priests and Pharisees *are* Jews, just as Jesus and his disciples are. Outside of a general sense that the term “the Jews” is used for those hostile to Jesus, the gospel is apparently not terribly consistent in its use of the term.

However, direct internal quotation may provide an important criterion for determining the Fourth Gospel’s positioning of “the Jews” as Jesus’ legal opponents in his trial against the world: in nearly every case where a hostile party quotes either Jesus or potential witnesses in his defense, that hostile party is explicitly, even awkwardly labeled “the Jews.” Sometimes this happens only because the Jews are the group already in the scene, as is the case several times in chapter eight.¹⁶⁸ However in other cases they unexpectedly

¹⁶⁷ Reading from a narrative point of view, Lincoln (*John*, 248) is typical when he comments: “The impression given... is that the evangelist is not much concerned with hard-and-fast categories. Distinct groups from the time of Jesus, the Pharisees and the chief priests, can be brought together and, in the light of the circumstances of the evangelist’s own time, can be labelled ‘the Jews’.”

¹⁶⁸ See, for example, 8:31 which starts off a new sub-scene by mentioning the Jews after a small narrative break (8:30) just before the first misunderstanding quotation of Jesus (8:33). Jesus’ dispute partners in this scene are a generic “they” (five times, cf. 8:34, 39, 41, 42) until 8:48, when “The Jews answered and said to him” with a self-quotation, and again in 8:52, “The Jews said to him” with a quotation of Jesus.

appear in order to quote Jesus or potential witnesses. In the healing of the sick man (5:9-10) we are belatedly told that it is the Sabbath, which has not yet been mentioned, and the Jews suddenly enter a scene in which they were nowhere to be found in order to interrogate the healed man just before quoting his testimony (5:12). In 6:41-42, “the Jews” unexpectedly appear in a scene in Galilee to quote Jesus twice, when previously his audience had only been a crowd (cf. 6:24). In the next chapter Jesus’ audience, previously referred to as Jerusalemites (7:25) and a crowd (7:20, 32), becomes “the Jews” prior to the only quotation of Jesus in the chapter (7:35-36).¹⁶⁹ Later Jesus seems to be addressing Pharisees (cf. 8:13) until “the Jews” quote him in 8:22. A jarring change of terminology occurs in the trial of the man born blind. The Pharisees have been named three times in close succession (9:13, 15, 16) before the man’s parents are called in as witnesses. The accusers are called “the Jews” as soon as they need to cite the supposed testimony of the witnesses (9:19).¹⁷⁰

Lastly, a notable example comes during Jesus’ own trial. The Jews have already appeared repeatedly throughout the trial, as late as 19:20, but so have the chief priests (cf. 19:15). Only when they ask Pilate to change the *titulus* to a quotation, “He said, ‘I am the Jews’ King’,” are they labeled “the chief priests *of the Jews*” (19:21)! This phrase appears nowhere else in the gospel. Whatever else might be going on with John’s fondness for using “the Jews” over the chief priests, rulers, and Pharisees (not to mention terms it fails to use, like scribes, elders, and Sadducees), the Fourth Gospel is remarkably consist-

¹⁶⁹ The Jews had appeared already in the chapter (7:11, 13), in fact providing the first reaction to Jesus (7:15), but they do not appear again until a quotation is needed, nor do they appear after the quotation.

¹⁷⁰ Apart from the narrative note in 9:22 that the Jews have intimidated the witnesses (see above), the term does not appear again in the chapter.

ent in assigning “the Jews” to any group that questions Jesus’ or another’s testimony through direct quotation.¹⁷¹

Only one likely exception exists: in 12:34 “the crowd” asks how Jesus can say the Son of Man must be lifted up.¹⁷² His immediate response is not hostile (12:35-36), but Jesus leaves “after saying these things” and hides from *them* because *they* did not believe in him (12:37). It is not entirely clear that “they” should be identified narrowly with the crowd, but it is likely. If we take the quotation as if made with hostile intent and not to clarify a perceived contradiction between what they have heard from Scripture and what Jesus says, it would provide the sole exception to the pattern. The repetitious use of “the Jews” to dissect testimony through quotation is well-established nonetheless, and it helps to set up this particular group as representative of the presumed prosecution. If the crowds have begun to question Jesus’ testimony in a similar manner to “the Jews,” it points to Jesus’ need to fulfill the prophecies of Isaiah—that few would believe or understand him (12:38-41)—and may signal the threat of darkness and judgment encroaching on the world (12:44-50).¹⁷³

¹⁷¹ In addition to Jesus’ multiple quotations to the Samaritan woman immediately after she labels him a Jew (cf. 4:9-10, 17) this character trait may appear in a scene between Jesus and Pilate. The latter asks Jesus if he is King of the Jews (18:33) and Jesus responds (18:34), “Do you speak (λέγεις) from yourself, or did others speak (εἰπὼν) about me?” Jesus is asking him to quote the actual accusers. Pilate, still thinking he is in control and refusing to admit that he is only parroting the chief priests, refuses to quote them and instead asks (18:35), “I am not a Jew, am I?”

¹⁷² See von Wahlde (*John*, 2:543, 759) for a redactional explanation for the use of “crowd” here.

¹⁷³ As pointed out above, even the disciples engage in this behavior in their first and final quotation of Jesus’ teaching (16:17-18) before they scatter and he is arrested.

In stark contrast to “the Jews” stands the narrator, whose authority is connected with the Beloved Disciple. The narrator quotes Jesus three times (13:11; 18:9; 21:23),¹⁷⁴ in each case to *clarify* his speech without any suggestion of misunderstanding. Just after the last of these cases, which defends Jesus from the accusation of a false statement regard-ing the death of the Beloved Disciple, we are told, “This is the disciple who testifies about these things and who wrote them, and we know that his testimony is true” (21:24). Unlike the characterization of “the Jews,” the Beloved Disciple is presented as a reliable witness for the defense of Jesus.

¹⁷⁴ Technically the narrator quotes Jesus at 6:41, but this is to explain the reaction of the Jews to Jesus’ speech, as recognized by Brankaer (“Citations internes,” 134 n. 5).

Table 5. Direct Internal Quotations in the Narrative Books of the New Testament

| Direct Internal Quotation in Mark | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 1 | Mark 3:22 - καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει | Mark 3:30 - ὅτι ἔλεγον πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει. |
| 2 | Mark 5:30 - ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἔλεγεν· τίς μου ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων; | Mark 5:31 - βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντα σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἥψατο; |
| 3 | [Common] | Mark 7:11 - ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε· ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· κορβάν ὃ ἐστιν δῶρον... |
| | | Matt 15:5 - ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρὶ· δῶρον ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφελθῇς οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ. |
| 4-6 | [Unverifiable] | Mark 6:14-16 - καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ. ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἡλίας ἐστίν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον ὅτι προφήτης ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν. |
| | [Unverifiable] | Luke 9:7-8 - διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ὑπὸ τινων δὲ ὅτι Ἡλίας ἐφάνη, ἄλλων δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. |
| 7 | [Unverifiable] | Mark 8:28 - οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, καὶ ἄλλοι Ἡλίαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι εἷς τῶν προφητῶν. |
| | [Unverifiable] | Luke 9:19 - οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπαν Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἡλίαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. |
| 8 | Mark 9:22 - ἀλλ' εἴ τι δύνη βοηθήσον ἡμῖν σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. | Mark 9:23 - ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· τὸ εἰ δύνη. |
| 9 | Mark 12:29-31 - ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν· ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν... | Mark 12:32 - εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεὺς· καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι εἷς ἐστίν καὶ οὐκ ἐστίν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ. |
| 10 | [Common?] | Mark 12:35 - πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι ὁ χριστὸς υἱὸς Δαυὶδ ἐστίν; |
| 11 | Mark 14:30 - καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. | Mark 14:72 - καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα δις φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ. |
| | Matt 26:34 - ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με. | Matt 26:75 - καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με. |
| | Luke 22:34 - ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ φωνήσῃς σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ ἕως τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι. | Luke 22:61 - καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Κυρίου, ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς. |

Table 5. Direct Internal Quotations in the Narrative Books of the New Testament (cont.)

| Direct Internal Quotation in Mark | | |
|---|---|--|
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 12 | [Unverifiable] | Mark 14:58 - Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω. |
| | [Unverifiable] | Matt 26:61 - Οὗτος ἔφη Δύναμαι καταλύσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομήσαι. |
| Direct Internal Quotation in "Q" Traditions | | |
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 1 | [Common?] | Matt 3:9* - καὶ μὴ δόξητε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ. |
| | | Luke 3:8* - καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ. |
| 2-3 | [Unverifiable] | Matt 11:18-19 - ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης μῆτε ἐσθίων μῆτε πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν· δαιμόνιον ἔχει. ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. |
| | | Luke 7:33-34 - ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς μὴ ἐσθίων ἄρτον μῆτε πίνων οἶνον καὶ λέγετε· δαιμόνιον ἔχει. ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων καὶ λέγετε· ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. |
| 4-5 | [Common] | Matt 16:2-3 - ὁψίας γενομένης λέγετε· εὐδία, πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός· καὶ πρωῒ· σήμερον χειμῶν, πυρράζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ οὐρανός. |
| | | Luke 12:54-55 -ὅταν ἴδητε νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε ὅτι ὄμβρος ἔρχεται, καὶ γίνεται οὕτως· καὶ ὅταν νότον πνέοντα λέγετε ὅτι καύσων ἔσται, καὶ γίνεται. |
| Direct Internal Quotation in Matthew Only | | |
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 1 | [Common; cf. LXX Exod 20:15; Deut 5:18] | Matt 5:21 - Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις Οὐ φονεύσεις. |
| 2 | [Common; cf. LXX Exod 20:13; Deut 5:17] | Matt 5:27 - Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη Οὐ μοιχεύσεις. |
| 3 | [Common; cf. LXX Deut 24:1 (?)] | Matt 5:31 - Ἐρρέθη δέ Ὅς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω αὐτῇ ἀποστάσιον. |
| 4 | [Common; cf. Num 30:2] | Matt 5:33 - Πάλιν ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις Οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου. |
| 5 | [Common; cf. LXX Exod 21:24; Lev 24:20; Deut 19:21] | Matt 5:38 - Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος. |

Table 5. Direct Internal Quotations in the Narrative Books of the New Testament (cont.)

| Direct Internal Quotation in Matthew Only | | |
|---|--|--|
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 6 | [Common; cf. LXX Lev 19:18] | Matt 5:43 - Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου. |
| 7 | [Imputed] | Matt 23:16 - Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὁδοῖοι τυφλοὶ οἱ λέγοντες· ὃς ἂν ὁμώσει ἐν τῷ ναῷ, οὐδὲν ἐστίν· ὃς δ' ἂν ὁμώσει ἐν τῷ χρυσῷ τοῦ ναοῦ, ὀφείλει. |
| 8 | [Imputed] | Matt 23:18 - καὶ ὃς ἂν ὁμώσει ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ οὐδὲν ἐστίν· ὃς δ' ἂν ὁμώσει ἐν τῷ δώρῳ τῷ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ ὀφείλει. |
| 9 | [Imputed] | Matt 23:30 - καὶ λέγετε· εἰ ἡμεθεὶς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν οὐκ ἂν ἡμεθεὶς αὐτῶν κοινωνοὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῶν προφητῶν. |
| 10 | [Imputed] | Matt 27:43 - εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι Θεοῦ εἰμι Υἱός. |
| 11 | Mt 20:19 - καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται. | Matt 27:63 - λέγοντες· κύριε, ἐμνήσθημεν ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὁ πλάνος εἶπεν ἔτι ζῶν· μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγείρομαι. |
| Direct Internal Quotation in Luke Only | | |
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 1 | Luke 7:19 - ἔπεμψεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον λέγων Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν; | Luke 7:20 - ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς πρὸς σέ λέγων Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν; |
| 2 | Luke 9:22 - εἰπὼν ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι. | Luke 24:6-7 - μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὧν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, λέγων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὅτι δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι. |
| | Luke 9:44 - ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων. | |
| | Lk 18:32-33 - παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεται. | |
| 3 | [Unverifiable] | Luke 24:44 - Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὧν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ. |

Table 5. Direct Internal Quotations in the Narrative Books of the New Testament (cont.)

| Direct Internal Quotation in Acts | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 1 | [Unverifiable] | Acts 1:4-5* - ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατε μου, ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἀγίῳ οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας. |
| 2 | [Unverifiable] | Acts 6:14 - ἀκηκόαμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος καταλύσει τὸν τόπον τοῦτον καὶ ἀλλάξει τὰ ἔθνη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς. |
| 3 | Acts 10:3-6 - καὶ εἰπόντα αὐτῷ Κορνήλιε. ὁ δὲ ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ καὶ ἔμφοβος γενόμενος εἶπεν· τί ἐστίν, κύριε; εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· αἱ προσευχαί σου καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἀνέβησαν εἰς μνημόσυνον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ νῦν πέμπω ἄνδρας εἰς Ἰόππην καὶ μετάπεμψαι Σίμωνα ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος, οὗτος ξενίζεται ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος βυρσέως παρὰ θάλασσαν. | Acts 10:31-32 - καὶ φησὶν· Κορνήλιε, εἰσηκούσθη σου ἡ προσευχή καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἐμνήσθησαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. πέμπω οὖν εἰς Ἰόππην καὶ μετακάλεσαι Σίμωνα ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος, οὗτος ξενίζεται ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος βυρσέως παρὰ θάλασσαν. |
| 4 | Acts 10:13 - καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν· ἀναστάς, Πέτρε, θῦσον καὶ φάγε. | Acts 11:7 - ἤκουσα δὲ καὶ φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι· ἀναστάς, Πέτρε, θῦσον καὶ φάγε. |
| 5 | Acts 10:14 - ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν· μηδαμῶς, κύριε, ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον. | Acts 11:8 - εἶπον δὲ· μηδαμῶς, κύριε, ὅτι κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον οὐδέποτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου. |
| 6 | Acts 10:15 - καὶ φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτὸν· ἂ ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν, σὺ μὴ κοίνου. | Acts 11:9 - ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ἐκ δευτέρου φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ἂ ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν, σὺ μὴ κοίνου. |
| 7 | [Acts 10:32] | Acts 11:13-14 - ἀπήγγειλεν δὲ ἡμῖν πῶς εἶδεν τὸν ἄγγελον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ σταθέντα καὶ εἰπόντα· ἀπόστειλον εἰς Ἰόππην καὶ μετάπεμψαι Σίμωνα τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Πέτρον, ὃς λαλήσει ῥήματα πρὸς σὲ ἐν οἷς σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκος σου. |
| 8 | [Acts 1:4-5] | Acts 11:16 - ἐμνήσθη δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς ἔλεγεν· Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. |
| 9-10 | Luke 3:16 - ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πᾶσιν ὁ Ἰωάννης· ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερος μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· | Acts 13:25 - ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρου Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον, ἔλεγεν· τί ἐμε ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ· ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετ' ἐμε οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι. |
| 11 | [Unverifiable] | Acts 20:35 - πάντα ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτως κοπιῶντας δεῖ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν· μακάριον ἐστὶν μάλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν. |

Table 5. Direct Internal Quotations in the Narrative Books of the New Testament (cont.)

| Direct Internal Quotation in Acts | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 12 | Acts 9:4 - καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἤκουσεν φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ· Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις; | Acts 22:7 - ἔπεσα τε εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις; |
| 13-14 | | Acts 26:14 - πάντων τε καταπεσόντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἤκουσα φωνὴν λέγουσαν πρὸς με τῇ ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ· Σαοὺλ Σαοὺλ, τί με διώκεις; σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. |
| 15-16 | Acts 9:5 - εἶπεν δέ· τίς εἰ κύριε; ὁ δέ· ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις· | Acts 22:8 - ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπεκρίθην· τίς εἶ, κύριε; εἶπεν τε πρὸς ἐμέ· ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος, ὃν σὺ διώκεις. |
| 16-17 | | Acts 26:15 - ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπα· τίς εἶ, κύριε; ὁ δὲ κύριος εἶπεν· ἐγὼ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις. |
| 18-19 | Acts 9:6 - ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἰσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ λαληθήσεται σοι ὃ τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. | Acts 22:10 - εἶπον δέ· τί ποιήσω, κύριε; ὁ δὲ κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με· ἀναστὰς πορεύου εἰς Δαμασκὸν κακεῖ σοι λαληθήσεται περὶ πάντων ὧν τέτακται σοι ποιῆσαι. |
| [17] | | Acts 26:16a - ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι καὶ στηθὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου. |
| 20 | [Unverifiable] | Acts 26:16b-18 - εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαι σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες με ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαι σοι, ἐξαιρούμενος σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληρὸν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ. |
| 21 | 9:17 - καὶ ἐπιθεὶς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας εἶπεν· Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ, ὁ κύριος ἀπέσταλκεν με, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ὀφθεῖς σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἧ ἤρχου ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃς καὶ πλησθῇς πνεύματος ἁγίου. | Acts 22:13 - ἐλθὼν πρὸς ἐμέ καὶ ἐπιστάς εἶπεν μοι· Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ, ἀνάβλεψον. |
| 22 | [Completing] | Acts 22:14-16 - ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προχειρίσατο σε γινῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἔση μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὧν ἐώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας. καὶ νῦν τί μέλλεις; ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. |

Table 5. Direct Internal Quotations in the Narrative Books of the New Testament (cont.)

| Direct Internal Quotation in Acts | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | Original Statement | Re-quotation |
| 23-25 | [Unverifiable] | Acts 22:18-21 - καὶ ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν λέγοντα μοι· σπεῦσον καὶ ἔξελθε ἐν τάχει ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ, διότι οὐ παραδέχονται σου μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ. καγὼ εἶπον· κύριε, αὐτοὶ ἐπίστανται ὅτι ἐγὼ ἤμην φυλακίζων καὶ δέρων κατὰ τὰς συναγωγὰς τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ ὅτε ἐξεχύνετο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρος σου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤμην ἐφεστὼς καὶ συνευδοκῶν καὶ φυλάσσων τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν ἀναιρούντων αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς με· πορεύου, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἐξαποστελῶ σε. |
| 26 | Acts 23:6 - ἔκραζεν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ· ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ Φαρισαῖος εἰμι, υἱὸς Φαρισαίων, περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν κρίνομαι. | Acts 24:21 - ἡ περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραξα ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστὼς ὅτι περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι σήμερον ἐφ' ὑμῶν. |
| 27 | [Unverifiable; cf. Acts 25:5] | Acts 25:16 - πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίθην ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαί τινα ἄνθρωπον πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχοι τοὺς κατηγοροὺς τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι περὶ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος. |
| 28 | [Unverifiable] | Acts 27:24 - λέγων· μὴ φοβοῦ, Παῦλε, Καίσαρι σε δεῖ παραστήναι, καὶ ἰδοὺ κεχάρισται σοι ὁ θεὸς πάντας τοὺς πλέοντας μετὰ σοῦ. |

CHAPTER 4

DIRECT INTERNAL QUOTATION AS A MEANS OF INCORPORATING AND DEVELOPING TRADITIONAL MATERIAL

“Therefore take the talent from him, and give to the one who has ten talents. For to everyone who has, it will be given, and he will have abundantly, but the one who does not have, even what he has will be taken from him.”

Matthew 25:28-29

For there will be no honor in any man who is not immortal, but only (in) those who were chosen from an immortal substance, which has shown that it is able to contain him who gives his abundance. Therefore I said, “Everyone who has, it will be given to him, and he will have plenty.”

Apocalypse of Peter (NHC VII, 3) 83.19-29¹

So far the scope of this study has broadened from an atomistic examination of each minute change made in individual quotations, to the various roles that direct internal quotation plays within the gospel as a whole. In this chapter we will again broaden the scope of the study to examine what DIQ says about the Fourth Gospel in the context of early Christian tradition. As will be evident in a number of cases, John uses direct internal quotation to incorporate traditional, pre-gospel material. The paraphrases and repetitions allow John to endorse traditional sayings or understandings of Christ, to critique others, or simply to move them in a direction that agrees with John’s theological understanding.

¹ Cf. also Luke 19:27. Translation of *Apoc. Peter* by Roger A. Bullard, “Apocalypse of Peter (VII, 3),” in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (ed. J.M. Robinson; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), 340-45.

Determining which material is likely to pre-date the Fourth Gospel is particularly difficult in such an early Christian text. I do not want to focus on how John draws in previous (non-Christ-following) Jewish material here, such as adaptations of OT language and motifs, or how the Fourth Gospel reflects ideologies similar to those found in Philo, the Qumran texts, or apocalyptic literature. That is a different, and much larger, study. I am interested in John's christology, eschatology, and soteriology, and how DIQ may offer us a window not only into how John compares to other groups of Christ-followers, but also how *aware* of those other groups' ideologies and rhetoric John may have been. The evidence for John's understandings, like those of other groups, is present only in texts, and this is where things can get tricky. Determining the relative date of first-century texts is notoriously difficult; the various solutions to the "Synoptic problem" are only one example. We might be confident that John post-dates the genuine letters of Paul, but what of the pseudo-Pauline letters? Or Acts? Or Revelation, for that matter? Even if we might think that a text post-dates John, it may still be relevant if we are somewhat confident that it is independent of Johannine thought. I offer no solutions to these questions, but their influence will be felt in the discussion and notes.

The bulk of the study in this chapter will be empirical: case by case, we will examine John's DIQ for parallels in other early Christian literature, including from time to time the early church fathers. Parallels with more numerous and significant lexical connections to John will be considered stronger, but modern scholars occasionally point us to parallels with only similar themes, or with similar formal or syntactic structures. The nature of the study will have a cumulative impact as we see case after case where

John presents traditional material, sometimes notably out of character for the Fourth Gospel, that is brought in and cited by the characters. The material is then fit into various Johannine motifs. With verifiable quotations, John's paraphrases often move the material in a direction that serves the literary or ideological purposes of the Fourth Gospel. I leave open the question of John's direct dependence on earlier texts such as the Synoptic Gospels, citing scholars in favor of both adaptation and independent development, not to mention scholars who appeal to John's accurate historical recollections, because in any event they support the point being made here: that John uses DIQ to comment on and develop sayings that pre-date the Fourth Gospel, whether they are Johannine, Synoptic, Pauline, or simply historical.

Before engaging with John, a brief study will present the direct internal quotations in the fourth century *Acts of Pilate*. Choosing a text this late provides somewhat of a control case since the influence evident in parallels between *Pilate* and the texts of the New Testament is almost certain to move in one direction, from the NT to *Pilate*.² In other words, we already know where *Pilate* is getting this stuff, so we can instead focus on how the later text uses DIQ to incorporate traditional material.

² Although see n. 12 below. Possible references to *Pilate*, or at least the traditions behind it, appear in Justin Martyr (*Ap.* 1.35.9, "the acts drawn up under Pontius Pilate"; cf. 1.48.3) and Epiphanius (*Ag. Her.* 50.1), but Eusebius refers to another *Acts of Pilate* used *against* Christianity in the fourth century (*Eccl. Hist.* 1.9.3-4; 9.5.1; 9.7.1), indicating there were multiple texts with similar titles but of wildly different character. Bart Ehrman and Zlatko Pleše, from whose edition I take the Greek text, survey potential dates ranging from the second century to the sixth, themselves settling on the fourth (*The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2011], 420). The direct dependence of *Pilate* on John is already evident in its other title, the *Gospel of Nicodemus*.

A Brief Case Study: *The Acts of Pilate*

The *Acts of Pilate* provides an informative case study linking the themes of the previous chapter to those of the present one. Above I argued that one of the major motivations for John's abundant use of DIQ is the role that testimony plays in the lawsuit motif developed throughout the Fourth Gospel. *Pilate* is an expanded narration of Jesus' trial before Pilate, purporting to give the public record of the trial, written in Hebrew by Nicodemus and translated into Greek.³ It is filled with DIQ as witness after witness is called up to testify in Jesus' trial. Much of this testimony is internally unverifiable and might justifiably be called *external* (although again it is internal to the story), for example the sick man's testimony that Jesus once told him, "Carry your bed and walk!" (6.1; cf. John 5:11). Yet a significant amount of DIQ is verifiable (see Table 6),⁴ and at least one unverifiable quotation (4.1) is modeled on a similar case in Matthew 26:61 ("This one said, 'I can destroy this sanctuary, and in three days build it up'").⁵

³ The shorter Greek recension (A) is dominated by the trial, although Jesus is executed by the 11th chapter and the narrative continues for five more with the (more informal) trials of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, outed as disciples when they bury Jesus. A longer recension (B) also includes Jesus' descent to the underworld where the prophets recount their own predictions as testimony regarding Jesus through external quotation, i.e. the prophetic pre-texts provide the material for their self-quotations.

⁴ It should be noted that Table 6 is only a partial list of DIQ in *Pilate*, namely DIQ evidently drawing on canonical tradition. More cases could be added, possibly (in some cases, likely) dependent on traditions outside of the New Testament.

⁵ *Pilate* no longer credits the statement to false witnesses but to "the Jews," perhaps under the influence of John which is alluded to, confusingly, after Pilate asks which sanctuary is meant: "The one that Solomon built in 46 years" (cf. John 2:20 referring to *Herod's* temple).

As in John, DIQ is used to reiterate accusations against Jesus:

A 1.1: Annas and Caiaphas and... the rest of the Jews came to Pilate accusing Jesus of many deeds, saying, “We know this one is a son of Joseph the carpenter, born from Mary, and *he calls himself Son of God and King*.”⁶

A 1.1: Pilate said to them, “Which evil deeds?” They said to him, “*He is a magician*.”⁷

A 2.3: The elders of the Jews replied, saying to Jesus, “What will we see? First, that *you were born of fornication*...”

A 2.5: Annas and Caiaphas said to Pilate, “These twelve are believed, that ‘He was not born of fornication’; all the multitude, we cry out, ‘He was born of fornication,’⁸ and ‘He is a magician,’ and ‘He calls himself Son of God and King,’ and we are not believed.”

The charges are stated first as the case is built, and then reiterated as the high priests feel they are losing ground.

Also as in John, a case is discursively made *for* Jesus and *against* Jesus’ accusers.

The former is done through the testimony of the witnesses and even of peripheral characters such as Pilate’s wife (2.1-2), or a courier who worships Jesus as he enters

⁶ See above, chapter 3 n. 121. The quoted phrase is turned into an indirect quote in 4.5: “He *called* himself [εἶπεν αὐτόν] Son of God and King.” Although *Pilate* is much less paraphrastic than John is, there are still many small modifications in the quotations. In the present case, εἶναι in 1.1 is dropped in 2.5.

⁷ Although the charge that Jesus is a magician (γόης ἐστιν) is not found in the canonical gospels, it is here attached to the familiar one that Jesus casts out demons by Beelzebul. The Jews have quoted themselves once already in 2.1 when Pilate’s wife sends the message about having nothing to do with this righteous man because she has suffered through the night (cp. Matt 27:19): Answering, the Jews said to Pilate, “Did we not tell you, ‘He is a magician’? Behold he sent a bad dream to your wife!” That *Pilate* incorporates a tradition of Jewish charges of magic against Jesus is evident from other literature (e.g. *b. Sanh.* 43a; Origen, *Ag. Cel.* 1.6).

⁸ See above, chapter 2 n. 145. That Jesus was *not* born of fornication is apparently an important issue for *Pilate*. Annas and Caiaphas have already claimed to have cried out that he was born of fornication and have been re-quoted by the narrator (each in 2.4). Their language echoes that of the twelve (among them Lazarus and James) who deny that Jesus was born of fornication (2.4). In addition to the reference the Jews make to this testimony in 2.5, they are referred to as “the twelve [men] who said, ‘He was not born of fornication’” on five other occasions (2.5 [2x], 2.6; 9.1; 12.1). It is not coincidental that claims in favor of Jesus outnumber claims against him (seven to four).

because he heard some children saying (1.3), “Save (σῶσον), [you] in the heights!

Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord.”⁹ The case against Jesus’ accusers

can be seen in the repetition of a familiar scene from Matthew (27:24-25):

9.4: Taking water, Pilate washed his hands before the sun, saying, “I am innocent of this righteous one’s blood. See to it yourselves!” Again the Jews cried out, “Let his blood be upon us and our children.”¹⁰

12.1: Joseph [of Arimathea] replied to them, “... Now the one who is uncircumcised in the flesh but circumcised in the heart, taking water he washed his hands before the sun,¹¹ saying, ‘I am innocent of this righteous one’s blood. See to it yourselves!’ And answering, you said to Pilate, ‘Let his blood be upon us and our children’.”

A scene that appears once in a single canonical gospel is now repeated (from 4.1) and even testified to by a member of the Jewish elite.¹²

So *Pilate* uses DIQ extensively to present itself as a court record, to make the case for Jesus’ innocence, and to make the case against his accusers. *Pilate* also uses DIQ to incorporate and to comment on traditional material. Table 6 presents only those cases of

⁹ Cp. especially Matt 21:9 // Mark 11:10. After this testimony, the Jews contend that the courier, being Greek, could not understand the statement spoken in Hebrew (1.4). The courier says that he asked what they were crying out. Pilate asks to hear it, and *the Jews* (not the courier) answer with the phrase in (transliterated) Hebrew, making them witnesses to the cry. Asked for a translation, they give the same statement as is quoted by the courier. Pilate asks them, “If *you* testify (ὁμεῖς μαρτυρεῖτε) to what was said by the voices of the children, what did the courier do wrong?”

¹⁰ *Pilate* 4.1 adds τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, “this righteous person.”

¹¹ There is already some minor textual confusion whether Pilate washes his hands before the “crowd” or the “people” (the 9th century Θ) in Matt 27:24 (cf. 27:25). “Sun” is evidently secure in *Pilate* 9.4, but here A has “people” while B, C, the Coptic, and the Latin have “sun” again. Although seemingly a pagan image (with the sun as a deity), the expression “before the sun” (more akin to doing something “in full daylight”) appears in Greek literature only in the Septuagint (e.g. LXX Num 25:4; 2 Kgdms 12:12), translating the Hebrew נִגַּד הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ. It is possible that doing things “before the Lord” and “before the sun” may have contributed to the outsider impression that Christians worshipped the sun (e.g. Tertullian, *Ad Nat.* 1.13), but I have not found any appeal to this expression in support of such a misunderstanding.

¹² The repetition and DIQ allow a threefold declaration of innocence by Pilate (including 4.1) comparable to what is found in Luke and John, but using Matthew’s more anti-Jewish scene.

DIQ that can be traced to the canonical gospels, and it is fairly extensive: at least 20 cases with ties to the NT, with several quoted multiple times. Furthermore, although quite conservative in its reproductions of Scripture and in its internal quotations, *Pilate* does not slavishly copy from the gospels. For example, we might compare the quotations of Dysmas, who is crucified with Christ, to the statements presented in Luke:

Luke 23:42: And he was saying (ἔλεγεν), “Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom!”

It is unclear whether we should take the Ἰησοῦ that follows “he was saying” as a dative (“he was saying to Jesus”) or a vocative, as translated.¹³ *Pilate* clarifies for us by adding an article:

Acts of Pilate A 10.2: And he was saying to Jesus (ἔλεγεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ), “Remember me, Lord, in your kingdom!”¹⁴

The vocative address is not only changed to a less ambiguous form (κύριε, not κυρίῳ), and perhaps to a more proper level of respect, it is also moved to the middle of the sentence. Later Dysmas comes forward in paradise to address the holy fathers recently brought up from the underworld:

Acts of Pilate B 26.1: “I was, just as you were saying, a bandit and a thief in the world, and for these reasons the Jews overpowered me and handed me over to death on the cross with our Lord Jesus Christ. And so while he was hanging on the cross, seeing the signs that occurred I believed in him, and I called upon him and said, ‘Lord, when you rule, do not forget me!’”¹⁵

¹³ As a vocative, see ESV, NASB, NIV, and NRSV, but as a dative, see KJV.

¹⁴ Other recensions, including B and the Coptic, add “when you come” in line with Luke.

¹⁵ Dysmas uses a cognate verb, βασιλεύσεις, rather than “in your kingdom.”

In his own retelling, the thief recognizes “Jesus” (as it appears in 10.2) as “our Lord Jesus Christ” and completes the thought of the earlier statement: Jesus has not only come into his kingdom, he now rules.

The *Acts of Pilate* seeks to accomplish three interrelated goals with its use of DIQ to incorporate traditional material. First, it wants to lend itself the authority of the familiar gospel accounts. By having witnesses recount testimony that is familiar to the audience, that the audience already expects to hear in this setting, the “court record” asserts its reliability. Its second goal is to lend support to the gospel accounts. The attribution of the information to Nicodemus, written down by the Jewish authorities in Hebrew while still under Pontius Pilate, are fictions meant to bolster the narrations of the trial in the canonical gospels, now supported by official court records and *written by the Jewish authorities*. Third, it seeks to clarify, smooth over, and harmonize the canonical gospels, which it seems to revere. For example, in the underworld (B 18.2) John the Baptist testifies that he said, “Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (cf. John 1:29), and also that he heard the voice of God the Father saying, “This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased” (cf. Matt 3:16-17). This allows *Pilate* not only to harmonize John with Matthew,¹⁶ but also to portray the Baptist as continuing to prophesy in Hades about *the Son of God who is about to come*.¹⁷

¹⁶ As *Pilate* seems to have worked it out, the baptism occurs between John 1:31 and 1:32 so that the Baptist can reflect on what he saw (as in John 1:32-33) and testify to what he heard at the baptism (thus harmonizing John 1:34 with Matt 3:17). Mark and Luke are apparently left to the side here.

¹⁷ This image of the Baptist is not unique to *Pilate*; e.g. see Origen, *In Luc. Hom.* 4 (PG 12 col. 1811) and Ps.-Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist* 1.45.

Table 6. *Acts of Pilate* and the New Testament Using DIQ

| Original Statement | Quotation | NT Parallel |
|---|---|---|
| A 1.1: "He calls himself God's Son and King" | A 2.5; 4.5 | Matt 27:43; John 19:21 |
| A 1.1: "This one... healed the lame and... the demon-possessed on the Sabbath by evil deeds." | A 6.1 | Mark 3:2; Luke 13:14; John 5:16 |
| [Unverifiable] | A 1.3: "Others were spreading their garments and saying, 'Save, [you] in the heights. Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord.'" | Mark 11:9; Matt 21:9; Luke 19:38; John 12:13 |
| A 2.1: His wife sent word to him saying, "There is nothing between you and this righteous man; for I suffered many things throughout the night because of him." | A 2.2 | Matt 27:19 |
| A 2.3: "What will we see? First, that you were born of fornication..." | A 2.4 (2x), 5 | John 8:41? |
| A 2.4: Some reverent Jews who were standing there said, "...we know that Joseph was engaged to Mary, and he was not born of fornication." | A 2.5 (3x), 6; 9.1; 12.1 | John 8:41? |
| [Unverifiable] | A 4.1: "This one said, 'I can destroy this temple, and in three days build it up'." | Mark 14:58; Matt 26:61; John 2:19; Acts 6:14 |
| A 4.1 (cf. 9.4): "I am innocent of this righteous man's blood. See to it yourselves!" | A 12.1 | Matt 27:24 |
| A 4.1 (cf. 9.4): "His blood be upon us and our children." | A 12.1 | Matt 27:25 |
| [Unverifiable] | A 6.1: "He had compassion and said a word to me, 'Carry your bed and walk!'" | John 5:8 |
| [Unverifiable] | A 6.2: "When Jesus passed by I cried out with a great voice, 'Have mercy on me, Son of David!'" | Mark 10:47-48; Matt 20:30-31; Luke 18:38-39 |
| [Unverifiable] | A 8.1: "Others said, 'He raised Lazarus, who had died, from the tomb after four days'." | John 11 |
| [Unverifiable] | A 13.1: "We heard the voice of an angel speaking to the women waiting at the tomb, 'Do not be afraid! For I know that you seek Jesus who was crucified...'" | Matt 28:5-7 |
| A 10.2: "Remember me, Lord, in your kingdom." | B 26.1 | Luke 23:42 |
| A 10.2: "Amen, amen I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise." | B 26.1 | Luke 23:43 |

Table 6. *Acts of Pilate* and the New Testament Using DIQ (Cont.)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| [Unverifiable] | A 14.1: "He was telling his disciples, 'Go into all the world and preach to all creation...'" (cf. B 14.1) | Mark 16:15-18 |
| [Unverifiable] | A 16.2: "When the great teacher Simeon took him in his arms, he said, 'Now release your slave, master...'" (cf. B 16.1) | Luke 2:28-35 |
| A 16.2: Simeon said to her, "It is good. Behold, this one is appointed for the falling and rising of many in Israel..." | A 16.6, 7 | Luke 2:34-35 |
| [Unverifiable] | B 18.2: "I [the Baptist] said to the people, 'Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world!'" | John 1:29 |
| [Unverifiable] | B 18.2: "I [the Baptist] also heard the voice of God and Father speaking like this: 'This is my Son the beloved, with whom I am well pleased'." | Mark 1:11; Matt 3:17 ; Luke 3:22 |
| [Unverifiable] | B 20.1: "For I [Satan] know that he is human, and I heard him also saying, 'My soul is deeply grieved unto death'." | Mark 14:34; Matt 26:38 |

The *Acts of Pilate* is not the only later Christian text to use DIQ to incorporate traditional material. Such a role of DIQ is evident also, for example, in the *History of Joseph the Carpenter* (6th or 7th century),¹⁸ and in many Gnostic texts.¹⁹ So at some point

¹⁸ In the opening frame (*Hist. Jos.* 1.1-8), Jesus sits on the Mount of Olives teaching his disciples and recalls things he has said to them "many times," citing or echoing heavily Heb 2:9; Luke 24:49; Rev 21:3-4; Matt 12:36; 2 Cor. 5:10; and Ps 32:16. Much of the quotation in the story proper comes from Jesus' first person narration, but even here the angel's message to Joseph, reported in Matt 1:20-21, is told (6.1) and retold (17.5-6). The frame is resumed as the *History* ends (30), where the apostles give a string of quotations of Jesus, including another echo of Luke 24:49 and an adaptation of Rev 22:18-19 (*Hist. Jos.* 30.7, "Whoever takes away from these words or adds to them, and so considers me a liar, I will soon take vengeance on him"). See also 31.10, where Jesus tells the disciples, adapting Rev 11:3-11, "the *Antichrist* will kill these two men and shed their blood upon the earth for a jug of water." The disciples ask (32.1), "Who are these two men of whom you have said, 'The *son of perdition* will kill them for a jug of water'?", effectively identifying the Antichrist (1-2 John) and the son of perdition (John 17:12; 2 Thess. 2:3), neither of which appear in Revelation, with the beast. See Ehrman and Pleše, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 163-93. In an example of using quotation to resist a traditional saying, see Ethiopic *Apoc. Peter* 2, where Peter asks Jesus, "Allow me to speak your word concerning the sinners, 'It were better for them if they had not been created'" [cp. Mark 14:21 // Matt 26:24 on Judas]. Jesus responds (quoting indirectly), "Peter, why *do you say* not to have been created were better for them? You resist God."

¹⁹ It is often difficult to tell in Gnostic texts when a quotation acts as an external citation (e.g. It is not as Moses said...), as a retelling of a biblical story, or as an internal (if often unverifiable) quotation. However, even conservatively we might point to *Gos. Thom.* 46 (cf. Matt 11:11 // Luke 7:28 and see below); *Gos.*

Christian writers began to use the device in this way. We can now test the hypothesis that the practice began as early as the Fourth Gospel at the end of the first century. We will begin with the Baptist's testimony before moving on to a more case-by-case format, ending with three sayings often tied in some way by modern scholars to the tradition found in Mark 9:1.

Traditional Material in the Fourth Gospel

The Testimony of John the Baptist

In his two scenes in the Fourth Gospel, the Baptist gives three unverifiable quotations (John 1:33, 34; 3:28) and, as I will argue, three verifiable ones, although two quote the same speech act (3:28/1:20; 1:15, 30/1:27). All five of the statements that the Baptist quotes have NT parallels in the Synoptic tradition:

Phil. 55:23-24 (cf. Matt 1:18, 20); *Origin of the World* 125.17-18 (cf. Mark 4:22 pars.); *Dial. Sav.* 136.5-10 (cf. Matt 24:27); *Apoc. Peter* 72.10-13; 73.10-14 (cf. Matt 15:14; 23:16, 24); 83.26-29 (cf. Matt 25:29); *Peter to Philip* 138.23-28 (cf. Luke 12:11; 21:12); and *Test. Truth* 73.18-21 (cf. Gal 1:8) as occurring within the present story but reflecting traditions. Two statements that are repeatedly woven into the narratives are, "I am [a jealous] God, and there is no other besides me" (cf. Exod 20:5; Deut 5:9; Isa 45:5; 46:9; but also 47:8, 10), which is credited to Ialdabaoth/Samael both in narration (*Origin of the World* 103.11-12; *Apocr. John* 11.19-22; *Hyp. Arch.* 94.21-22; 95.4-5; *Second Treatise of Seth* 53.29-30; *Test. Truth* 48.4-7) and in quotation (*Origin of the World* 105.30-31; 112.28-29; *Apocr. John* 13.8-9; 2 *Seth* 64.18-26), and the DIQ from Gen 2-3 regarding what Adam and Eve can and cannot eat (*Origin of the World* 118.19-31; *Gos. Phil.* 73.10-12; *Hyp. Arch.* 88.27-32; 89.34-90.5; *Test. Truth* 45.24-32; 46.26).

Table 7. Statements Quoted by John the Baptist with Synoptic Parallels

| Quoted Statement in John | Synoptic Tradition Parallel |
|--|---|
| John 1:20: "I am not the Christ" ²⁰ | Acts 13:25: "I am not he" ²¹ |
| John 1:27: "One is coming after me of whom I am not worthy that I should undo the strap of his sandal" | Mark 1:7: "The one who is stronger than me is coming after me, of whom I am not fit, having stooped down, to undo the strap of his sandals" |
| John 1:33: "On whomever you see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, this is the one who baptizes in Holy Spirit" | Mark 1:8, 10: "He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit"... he saw the heavens torn apart and the Spirit descending like a dove on him. |
| John 1:34: "This is the Son of God" | Matt 3:17: "This is my Son, the beloved, with whom I am well pleased." |
| John 3:28: "I am sent ahead of him" | Luke 7:27: "Behold, I am sending my messenger before you, who will prepare your way ahead of you" |

The identification of John 1:15, 30 as quotations of the logion in John 1:27 is not entirely without controversy. The absolute preexistence of Jesus, supported by the quotations, is so overwhelming that it is difficult to see how they could originate in the somewhat prosaic statement about the relative social status of John and Jesus. It is the Fourth Gospel's use of DIQ that allows it to move the logion to support the important Johannine motif of the Word's preexistence, while grounding it in recognizable tradition. Before we get to that argument, however, let us examine how the Fourth Gospel uses DIQ to endorse and re-purpose traditional material in the other quotations from the Baptist.

²⁰ Quoted in John 3:28.

²¹ The closest antecedent title is "savior of Israel" (Acts 13:23), namely Jesus, who is then identified with the one who comes after John (13:25).

In the Synoptics, the contrast of baptisms is attached to the logion about the one coming after the Baptist: he baptizes in water, but the coming one will baptize in (Holy) Spirit (and fire) (Mark 1:8; Matt 3:11; Luke 3:16). The baptism of Jesus soon follows, in each text including the Spirit descending like a dove onto Jesus (Mark 1:10; Matt 3:16; Luke 3:22). Unique to John, the Baptist reports a message he received from God prior to the revelation of Jesus:

John 1:32-33: “I have seen *the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove*, and it remained *on him*. And I didn’t know him, but the one who sent me to *baptize in water*, that one told me: ‘*On whomever you see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, this is the one who baptizes in Holy Spirit*’.”²²

Italicized words could feasibly be borrowed directly from the Synoptic accounts, and the rest of the scene is recognizable from them.²³ John evidently approved of the tradition, but by making the Baptist a direct eye-witness to the Spirit’s descent and then testifying to the correlation of God’s word and its fulfillment, the Fourth Gospel heightens the Baptist’s role as a witness to Christ.

The Baptist ends by claiming that he has testified (1:34), “This is God’s Son” (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ). At Jesus’ baptism in Mark (1:11) and Luke (3:22), a heavenly voice speaks directly to Jesus saying, “You are my son.” In the same scene in Matthew (3:17), the phrasing of the voice (presumably audible to witnesses) is even closer to John’s, “This is my son” (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου). John does not record the baptism of Jesus, but it has the Baptist deliver a message traditionally associated with the

²² P^{75c} vid, C*, and sa add “and fire” in harmonization with Matt 3:11 // Luke 3:16.

²³ Johannine “modifications” include: explicitly crediting a vision of the Spirit to the Baptist rather than or in addition to Jesus’ vision (Mark and Matt), the note that John did not know him, the Spirit remaining on Jesus, and the preparatory message given to the Baptist that can be quoted here.

event. If the Synoptic scene is in view, his testimony might be heard as an indirect reference to the heavenly voice: God says, “This is my Son” and John testifies, “This is God’s Son,” as it seems *Acts of Pilate* understood the scene (see above). Otherwise John reflects the tradition that Jesus was declared God’s Son in the presence of the Baptist by a *voice*, here the Baptist himself (cf. 1:23) rather than a *bat qol*. Yet again the Fourth Gospel turns the declaration into testimony of the Baptist.

There are some significant problems with John 1:34, though. Is the perfect μεμαρτύρηκα used with past or present force, i.e. in his *present* testimony has the Baptist implicitly given evidence that Jesus is the Son of God without saying it directly?²⁴ Does the confession represent a direct quotation, an indirect quotation, or a summary?²⁵ The construction is ambiguous. Furthermore, there is strong evidence for an alternative reading: “This is God’s Elect” (ὁ ἐκλεκτός).²⁶ We might tie such a confession to Luke’s

²⁴ Or does the perfect match the tense of ἐώρακα, used frequently in John for visions of Christ or other divine manifestations (cf. 6:46; 9:37; 14:9; 20:18, 29)? Each of these, however, has primarily *past* force even if present force is allowed (esp. in 14:9).

²⁵ That is, should we read: 1) “I have testified, ‘This is God’s Son’”; 2) “I have testified that this is God’s Son”; or, in essence, 3) “My testimony all points to the fact that this is God’s Son”?

²⁶ For the alternate reading, see P¹⁰⁶, N*, some late miniscules and Syriac manuscripts, as well as Ambrose and Augustine (1/4). For a detailed discussion of the evidence for and an argument in support of “God’s Elect,” see Tze-Ming Quek, “A Text-Critical Study of John 1.34,” *NTS* 55/1 (2009): 22-34. External evidence heavily favors “Son.” Internally though, scribes may have tended toward the more typically Johannine title, “Son of God,” and may have harmonized John with the Synoptics where “my Son” appears. Peter R. Rodgers (“The Text of John 1:34,” in *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs* [eds. C. Seitz and K. Greene-McCreight; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999], 299-305) argues instead for an originally conflated reading, partially evident in OL b: “This is the unique, chosen Son of God.” In this case, an original “Son” merely survived the harmonization rather than being a result of it. Christopher W. Skinner (“‘Son of God’ or ‘God’s Chosen One’ (John 1:34)? A Narrative-Critical Solution to a Text-Critical Problem,” *BBR* 25/3 [2015]: 341-57) finds such a reading “late and derivative,” instead siding with “Chosen One” because the term appears alongside the Lamb of God who takes away unrighteousness from the Land in the Enochic literature (see also next note), and thus harmonizes with the Baptist’s apocalyptic outlook and reflects a limited understanding: Jesus as conquering lamb, to which John will add Jesus as sacrificial lamb through its depiction of the Passion.

crucifixion scene, “Let him save himself if *this is God’s Messiah, the Elect*” (ὁ ἐκλεκτός, 23:35), as well as its transfiguration scene, “This is my Son who has been chosen” (ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, 9:35). At the very least, Luke and other early texts give evidence of the use of “Elect” as a messianic title, even if it later went out of fashion in favor of “Son.”²⁷ Whichever is the original reading, and *if* the Baptist refers to a past speech act, John has again used DIQ to incorporate and endorse a traditional element through the testimony of the Baptist.

Whether the Baptist refers to Jesus as God’s Son or his Elect, the title can be traced through Christian development to traditions found in Jewish literature.²⁸ The Baptist gives additional testimony in the third chapter, where he offers a quotation that likely has ties to OT passages elsewhere attached to the Baptist, not as they are found in the LXX, but as they appear filtered through the Synoptic tradition.²⁹ At John 3:28 the Baptist quotes himself as saying, “I am sent ahead of that one” (ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμι ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου). This statement serves as a highly paraphrastic summary quotation of the Baptist’s testimony on the second day, where he refers to himself as sent (although using πέμπω, 1:33) in anticipation of one coming after him (although there *Jesus* had

²⁷ The title itself is often tied to Isa. 42:1, in which case Jesus would replace Israel. Quek also points to a number of passages from the *Similitudes of Enoch*, as well as 4Q534 (possibly building on Isa 11:1-6 or Ps. 89:4 and so Davidic, but it may apply the title to Noah), 4Q174, *Asc. Isa.* 8.7, and *Tg. Isa.* 42:1 for messianic uses of “Chosen One” (Quek, “John 1.34,” 29). In Christ-following circles, see 1 Peter 2:6 and *Barn.* 6:2, citing Isa. 28:16, and *1 Clem.* 64.1.

²⁸ According to Gordon D. Fee, “The question is whether it reflects the Messianism of such a passage as Psalm 2:7 or that of Isaiah 42:1” (“The Textual Criticism of the New Testament,” in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary* [12 vols; ed. F.E. Gaebelin; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979], 1:432).

²⁹ C.H. Dodd (*Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* [2nd edition; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989], 271-72) traces the similarities between John and the later Synoptics to (hypothetical) early *testimonia* that included Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3.

become *ahead of* [ἔμπροσθεν] the Baptist, 1:30).³⁰ It is likely that the Baptist's particular phrasing is built on allusions to Malachi 3:1 (and Exod 23:20) as they appear in the Synoptic Gospels:

Luke 7:27 // Matt 11:10: "This [the Baptist] is concerning whom it was written, 'Behold I am sending (ἀποστέλλω) my messenger before you, who will prepare your way ahead of you (ἔμπροσθέν σου)'."³¹

Although not as close to John in phrasing, Mark begins his gospel with a citation of this line mistakenly credited to Isaiah (1:2). The Second Gospel follows it with a citation of Isaiah 40:3, which importantly is cited in John *not* by the narrator but *by the Baptist himself* (John 1:23).³² So John imagines the Baptist citing one scriptural passage attached to him elsewhere in Christ-following circles (1:23), and through his later testimony has the Baptist imply that he cited another (3:28). Not only does the quotation align the

³⁰ Brown (*John*, 1:154) traces several options: 1) that 3:27-30 is a doublet of 1:19-34, 2) that 3:27-30 is the original opening of the gospel, but has been replaced by 1:19-34, and 3) Brown's hypothesis, that 3:27, 29-30 represent fragments of a larger tradition about the Baptist that has been split in the final redaction. If Brown is correct, then the quotations in 3:28 are later additions modifying earlier material (from 1:19-34) in order to connect the testimony of the Baptist.

³¹ LXX Mal 3:1 reads, "Behold I send *out* (ἐξαποστέλλω) my messenger and the way will be watched before my face." LXX Exod 23:20 reads, "Behold I send (ἀποστέλλω) my messenger before my face so that he may guard you on the way, so that he may lead you to the land which I prepared for you." The note about guarding on *the way* and *preparing* a place/land may have originally led to the connection with Isa 40:3, as it appears in Mark. However LXX Mal 3:1 continues, "and the Lord whom you seek (ζητεῖτε) and the righteous messenger/angel whom you desire will suddenly come into his own sanctuary (εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ). 'Behold, he comes!' says the Lord Almighty." Given that John places Jesus' disruption in the temple, where his own body is identified with the sanctuary (ναός, John 2:19, 21), unexpectedly between the Baptist's two appearances, Malachi should be kept in mind.

³² See also Matt 3:3 and Luke 3:4. A similar tension in attribution appears within the Lukan tradition, between Luke 3:16 and Acts 1:4-5, in the latter case with Jesus quoting himself as saying something Luke attributes to the Baptist (on the grammatical difficulties here, see chapter 3 n. 136). It is unclear whether they reflect a literary issue, with different texts making different attributions, or a more serious historical problem in light of early prophetic practices among Christians: the prophet speaks through Jesus, and the words are credited to the Baptist. Either case is viable, but the literary solution—that John has the Baptist say these words to align his testimony with that of Scripture, especially in light of the argument in 5:33-39—is sufficient.

Baptist's testimony with that of Scripture (cf. 5:33, 39), it also aligns his testimony with that of the narrator, who introduces the Baptist as one who is sent (ἀπεσταλμένος) from God (1:6).

There is another bit of quoted testimony in John 3:28: "I am not the Messiah." Unlike the previous quotations, this one is verifiable: when priests and Levites are sent to investigate him, the Baptist answers their rather broad, "Who are you?" with a fairly definite, "I am not the Messiah" (John 1:20).³³ In Acts 13:25, Paul quotes the Baptist as asking, "Who do you suppose me to be?" and answering his own question with, "I am not he."³⁴ The Fourth Gospel and Acts seem to share a similar tradition, although it is not entirely clear that they do so independently.³⁵ In any case there is evidence that DIQ was used to incorporate pre-existing tradition: if they are independent, then the two texts most likely record, through DIQ, a tradition pre-dating both of them;³⁶ if John knew Acts, then it incorporates the denial into two sets of Baptist material using DIQ; if Acts knew John, it has Paul quote the Baptist in a way that reflects one of its sources. In John the verifiable quotation connects the testimonies of the Baptist, giving them a consistency they

³³ Ismo Dunderberg, "Johannine Anomalies and the Synoptics," in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives* (JSNTSup 182; eds. J. Nissen and S. Pedersen; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 108-25, here 113: "John's direct denial that he is the Messiah does not exactly correlate with this question."

³⁴ The tradition also appears in Luke 3:15 where some wonder whether the Baptist might be the Messiah, to which he responds with the saying about the stronger one coming after him (Luke 3:16). Francis E. Williams ("Fourth Gospel and Synoptic Tradition: Two Johannine Passages," *JBL* 86/3 [1967]: 311-19) argues that John is dependent on the passage in Luke. I leave the question open.

³⁵ See n. 39 below.

³⁶ Another option would be that both, responding to similar situations, coincidentally had the Baptist deny that he is the Christ/coming one through embedded speech. This seems to me less likely than a shared tradition, but is nevertheless possible.

lack in the Synoptics³⁷ and leading into his comments regarding the bridegroom (3:29-30).

Two other self-citations by the Baptist quote, and through quotation modify, a single traditional logion. John records the Baptist's prediction that someone more important is coming after him:

John 1:26-27: "I baptize in water. Among you stands one you do not know, the one coming after me of whom I am not worthy that I should undo the strap of his sandal (ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος)."

A similar tradition is found in all three Synoptic Gospels and in Acts:

Mark 1:7-8: "*The one* who is stronger than me *is coming after me* (ἐρχεται... ὀπίσω μου), *of whom I am not fit* (οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανός), having stooped down, *to undo the strap of his sandals* (λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ). I baptized you in water..."

Matt 3:11: "I baptize you in water of repentance. But *the one who comes after me* (ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος) is stronger than me, *whose sandals I am not fit* (οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανός τὰ ὑποδήματα) to carry."

Luke 3:16: "I baptize you with water, but the one who is stronger than me *comes* (ἐρχεται),³⁸ *of whom I am not fit to undo the strap of his sandals* (οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανός λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ)."

Acts 13:25: "But behold, *he comes* (ἐρχεται) after me, *the one of whom I am not worthy to undo the sandal* (οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημα... λῦσαι) of his feet."

We seem to have five variants of a common tradition, with lexical and grammatical differences running through all of them.³⁹ Yet in each the same rhetorical point is being

³⁷ On the inconsistency of the Synoptic portrayal of John the Baptist, I am thinking particularly of the introductory scene, where the Baptist definitively identifies Jesus as the one who comes, and the Baptist's subsequent question whether Jesus is the coming one (Luke 7:19-20; Matt 11:3).

³⁸ Mark 1:7; Luke 3:16 and Acts 13:25 use the indicative ἐρχεται, which appears in John's first quotation, "a man comes" (1:30).

made: the Baptist does not claim any special status for himself. Instead, he points to one coming after him who has much higher status, so high that John is not worthy or fit to serve him in the most menial way.

John not only has the Baptist make a statement reflecting this tradition, it presents the Baptist as quoting it twice more (John 1:15, 30).⁴⁰ Some would deny any link between the Baptist's self-citations and John 1:27. Dodd, for example, views 1:15, 30 as unverifiable quotations even if he allows that they express "more picturesquely" the same idea as 1:27.⁴¹ The severing of 1:27 from its subsequent quotations stems from two factors in addition to paraphrase, one thematic and one literary. Thematically, preexistence is too quickly read into the quotations as their main point. Since preexistence is absent in 1:27, the two cannot be connected. However with the progression of quotations John shifts the focus from the Baptist's lower social status to Jesus' preexistence, a progression

³⁹ For a detailed examination of the five variants of the logion, see Heinrich Lausberg, "Der Vers J 1,27 des Johannes-Evangeliums: Rhetorische Befunde zu Form und Sinn des Textes," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 6 (1984): 3-16. Both John 1:27 and Acts 13:25 use ἄξιος instead of ἱκανός, which has led to conjectures either of a direct relationship between John and Acts (so Freed, "Jn 1,19-27," 1957 [Acts → John] or Shellard, *New Light on Luke*, 216-18 [John → Acts]), or of a shared tradition. Both Bodmer papyri read ἱκανός in John 1:27; although they are early, they are also unique. Given the amount of harmonization to the Synoptic baptism accounts that is evident in the manuscripts of this passage, it is likely that this is an example of the same phenomenon.

⁴⁰ On this point, see Lindars, *John*, 110; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:274; Keener, *John*, 1:419; Étienne Trocmé, "Jean et les Synoptiques: L'Exemple de Jean 1,15-34," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (BETL 100; 3 vols.; eds. F. van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 3:1935-41; Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary* (trans. J. Vriend; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 55.

⁴¹ Dodd, *Tradition*, 271-73. For others, see Moloney, *John*, 39-40, 52-53; Lincoln, *John*, 107, 112-13; von Wahlde, *John*, 2:47-48. The connection between 1:27 and 1:15, however, is evident in the manuscripts, which frequently harmonize the verses. Many, beginning with A, insert ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν into 1:27, so that 1:15 and 1:27 share two clauses rather than one (which drives 1:27 further from the Synoptic parallels). Meanwhile one also suspects that the οὗτός ἐστιν inserted at the beginning of 1:27 in Ψ (9th-10th centuries) is influenced by the similar introduction in 1:30 (other witnesses, also beginning with A, insert αὐτός ἐστιν here). Interestingly the manuscripts do not show harmonization going the other way, i.e. harmonizing 1:15, 30 with 1:27. See the Appendix for more.

we will examine momentarily. The literary problem is that 1:15 gives a proleptic quotation, anticipating the subsequent narrative from a post-narrative or more to the point, post-resurrection perspective. Yet putting aside John's use of prolepses else-where (cf. 3:24; 7:39; 11:2), the quote's location in a prologue that shares the reader's post-resurrection viewpoint allows such an anticipation.⁴²

It is accepted often without argument that the repeated logion in John 1:15, 30 primarily testifies to Christ's preexistence.⁴³ I would agree that it does testify to this, but we should take a moment to examine how the Fourth Gospel makes the case so effectively using the devices of polyvalent language and DIQ favored by John. In the original speech act (1:27), the Baptist refers to one coming after him (ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος). The phrase (ὁ) ὀπίσω μου can suggest "behind" in space (primarily), status (say, as a student), and time (both secondarily).⁴⁴ They are not mutually exclusive: the physical posteriority of a student following his teacher provides a visual image of his lower status

⁴² To use a later Christian example, the *History of Joseph the Carpenter* shows Jesus telling the life of his adopted father to his disciples. In the opening frame story, Jesus tells them, "Beloved brothers and children of my good Father... you know that I have told you many times, 'I must be crucified and taste death for the sake of all...'" (1.1-2; cp. Heb. 2:9). A string of self-quotations follow that incorporate sayings from the gospels and Revelation (see above, n. 18). However, a variant of the first quoted phrase (sharing six words in the same order) also appears *in the story* he tells as he lays Joseph's body to rest (28.13). That is, not only does *Hist. Jos.* incorporate traditional material from Hebrews using DIQ, its prologue quotes the speech act as a past event before narrating its delivery within the story.

⁴³ Gerhard A. van den Heever ("John the Baptist and the Pre-Existence of Jesus in the Gospel of John: The Social Rhetoric of Pre-Existence Pronouncements in John 1:15, 27, 30," *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 20 [2009]: 45-76), who argues that the logia primarily comment on the relative *social* status of Jesus and John, surveys and critiques previous arguments for preexistence by a number of scholars. In the end, van den Heever downplays the implications of preexistence too strongly, perhaps to create room for the issues of social status that he wishes to highlight, but his argument is useful in examining how John supports its understanding of Christ's preexistence through a logion originally pointing to social status by focusing on implicit temporal features within the saying.

⁴⁴ Notice that the Lukan tradition avoids the problem of Jesus' potential discipleship to John, either by eliminating "after me" (Luke 3:16) or by referring to one who comes μετ' ἐμὲ (Acts 13:25).

(cf. Mark 8:33-34 pars.; Matt 4:19).⁴⁵ Yet it is also possible to read ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος as the one who comes after me *in time*. Does John mean for his reader to hear echoes of the theologically and messianically loaded phrase, “the one who comes,” or does it split the words on purpose to diminish the volume of this echo?⁴⁶ The language of “the one coming after me” is already evident in the tradition (Matt 3:11; also Mark 1:7), where it is indeed temporal although not in support of absolute preexistence, but of status: the one coming after me (and so generally having lesser status) is actually so strong that I am not fit to undo his sandals (and so has much greater status). At this point,

⁴⁵ J.P. Louw and E.A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 470, 718; also van den Heever, “Pre-Existence of Jesus,” 59. John does not seem to exploit outright the double-valency here, i.e. both “the one coming after me” and “my disciple who is coming.” However, the potency of the double entendre was felt in 20th century scholarship (see e.g., Dodd, *Tradition*, 273-75), where Jesus is supposed to be one of John’s disciples, not merely someone who approaches him for baptism. Keener (*John*, 1:457), on John 1:30, points instead to “status-conscious ancients [who] allowed those of higher rank to enter or be seated before them as a mark of respect. Such respect was typically accorded to the aged, *but for the Gospel’s informed audience* [i.e. auditors who minimally have just heard the prologue], the respectable antiquity to which the Johannine Baptist refers is no mere matter of primo-geniture or age, but preexistence itself (1:1-3)” (emphasis added). Suffice it to say that the characters in the scene are not informed readers or listeners.

⁴⁶ The article (ὁ) is omitted only in B and κ*. Barrett (*John*, 175) argues that it was added by scribes “to form... what was a recognized Christian title of the Messiah,” but it could easily be omitted accidentally coming directly before ὀπίσω. In the Septuagint, the participle appears significantly in Ps 117:26 (cited in John 12:13; cf. Mark 11:10 // Matt 21:9 // Luke 19:38; also Matt 23:39; Luke 13:35) and Hab 2:3; other forms of ἐρχομαι appear in Gen 49:10; Ezek 21:32; Isa 40:10; Mal 3:1; and Zech 9:9 (cited in John 12:15). In fact, the double testimony of the Baptist is echoed later in Jesus’ triumphal entry by the double testimony of Scripture, which likewise moves from ὁ ἐρχόμενος (“blessed is the one who comes”) to ἐρχεται (“Behold your King comes sitting on a colt of a donkey”). Outside of the passages already cited, see Matt 11:3 // Luke 7:19-20 (note the DIQ); Heb 10:37; Rev 1:4, 8; 4:8 for the participle with article. The participle acquires theological and messianic dimensions in John, as it is later used with the one who comes from above/heaven (3:31), the Prophet who is coming into the world and whom the people try to make king (6:14-15; cf. 18:37), the Messiah and Son of God who comes into the world (11:27), and finally the King of Israel who comes in the name of the Lord (12:13). Eduardo Arens (*The HΛΘON-Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-Critical Investigation* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976], 288) calls ὁ ἐρχόμενος a *terminus technicus* that “encompasses the Messianic expectations of Judaism and the Christians’ realization of its accomplishment.” However, he soon distances John 1:15, 27 from this complex of meanings, arguing that here the article is pronominal while the participle has a “purely verbal function” (pp. 289-90). Additionally, it is unclear that uninformed listeners—or secondary characters—would pick up on this without the benefit of the rest of the gospel.

the Fourth Gospel expresses more or less the same paradoxical relationship between John and Jesus.

It is not long before John recalls his declaration, although he paraphrases extensively. When John sees Jesus coming toward him, he says:

John 1:29-30: “Behold the lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world! This is the one about whom I said, ‘A man comes after me who ranks ahead of me, because he was before me’ (ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν).”

In place of the potentially suggestive participle of 1:27, John gives a more prosaic, indicative construction: a man comes after me. There may be subtle messianic significance to the use of ἀνὴρ in the broader context of the gospel,⁴⁷ but John has constructed the variant so that it can be heard by the characters in the scene and by an uninformed auditor as, “I told you a guy is coming...” This “guy” can still be a disciple,⁴⁸ and John draws out the same paradox: the man who was *behind me*, a disciple, has come to be *ahead of me*, the master:

The expression in John i. 30, ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ, would in any other context almost certainly be understood as meaning, ‘there is a man following me’, that is, among my disciples or adherents... The Baptist has now realized (we may suppose) that there is a man among his followers... who is and always has been

⁴⁷ Frédéric Manns (“Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse Johannique,” *RB* 92/4 [1985]: 525-38, here 535), following Luis Alonso Schökel (“Las sandalias del mesías esposo: Simbolos del Antiguo Testamento como lenguaje del Nuevo Testamento,” *Cuadernos de Teología* 5/3 [1978]: 198-210, here 204), connects the use of ἀνὴρ to the messianic wedding, each pointing to the wedding at Cana (and its jars for purification, 2:1-11) and the wedding imagery of the Baptist’s last appearance (in the context of a question regarding purification, 3:25-30) in support of this development in the Fourth Gospel. While they make a fairly solid case, it is at best a subtle set-up for this motif. Dodd does not connect ἀνὴρ to “husband” but rather observes that the phrasing of 1:30 “comes naturally in a piece of narrative” while the more abstract phrasing of 1:15 “is embedded in a formal theological statement” (*Tradition*, 274). He is also basically correct; although he can only be so decisive because he fails to connect 1:15 to 1:27 (see above, n. 41).

⁴⁸ Johannine double meaning is often inclusive, so it is possible to take ὀπίσω μου as indicating *both* discipleship *and* temporal posteriority.

essentially his superior, and so acknowledges that he must yield him precedence.⁴⁹

“A man comes after me” is an adequate, contextually appropriate paraphrase of “one is coming after me,” and the modified conclusion rather banally draws out the implications of the Baptist’s original symbol: that man ranks ahead of me. What is novel is the reason, “because he was before me.”⁵⁰

The question is whether the third clause necessarily introduces temporal priority as the basis for Jesus’s superiority. Van den Heever points to a number of inscriptions in Asia Minor that use *μόνος καὶ πρῶτος* to honor the recipients, while a number of others praise Ephesus as the “foremost city” (*ἡ πρώτη μητρόπολις*); none of them imply pre-existence or even greater antiquity.⁵¹ It could be that Jesus has become ahead of John simply because he was always foremost of the two. However, if much of the language of John’s paraphrase can still be read in terms of relative social status, temporal priority may

⁴⁹ Dodd, *Tradition*, 274.

⁵⁰ Although it is universally taken as part of the quotation, *ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν* may rather explain why John said this: “...about whom I said, ‘After me comes a man who ranks ahead of me,’ [and I said this] *because* he was before me” (cp. especially 10:36; but also 9:22; 12:6; 16:4, 8-11). However, if we include it in the speech act as is usual, the Baptist replaces one bi-clausal description of the one coming after him that indicates higher status with another: “I am not worthy that (*ἵνα*) I should undo the strap,” or “he is ahead of me because (*ὅτι*) he was before me.”

⁵¹ Van den Heever, “Pre-Existence of Jesus,” 61-63. There are a number of surviving stories about the founding and building up of Ephesus, especially through its temple, but no one goes so far as to say that Ephesus is the *most ancient* or *first* city in Asia (Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 4.31.8 says only that the temple is ancient, *παλαιστάτου*). Van den Heever also notes the appearance of *μονογενής* in John 1:14, just before the coming one is referred to as *πρῶτος* in 1:15, which suggests to him a similar combination of adjectives, but he goes too far in arguing that the prologue is primarily saying that Jesus is “singular and foremost” in status only, with *ἐν ἀρχῇ* (1:1-2) functioning like the *ἅπ’ αἰῶνος* assigned to a victor in an inscription from Smyrna. The point of the inscription, that the honoree is the “singular and foremost victor of all time,” is not quite what John is up to in the prologue even if the verbal echoes of this established rhetoric might serve John’s purposes.

be signaled by its final choice of verb tense: he *was* (ἦν) before me.⁵² The past force of this verb is underlined by the density of present verbs preceding it.⁵³ The choice of the imperfect over the present *allows* a temporal comparison rather than one simply of status.⁵⁴ We have the first hint that Jesus has greater status than John *at least in part* because he precedes John, although it would be unclear to anyone in the scene in what precise way Jesus does so. Could the Pharisees simply look for an older man?⁵⁵ Or are scholars like Robinson and Brown correct that the Baptist understands Jesus to be the coming Elijah: preexistent certainly, but not eternal?⁵⁶ The point is not that the authors understood Jesus in these ways, but that the absolute preexistence of Jesus, even prior to the world, is difficult to infer from the context of John 1:19-34 alone. We understand

⁵² Since Dodd seeks out the tradition behind the Fourth Gospel, he largely skirts the issue of the third clause by claiming it is an addition by the Evangelist (*Tradition*, 272; compare also above, n. 50). He argues, however, that the clause, including its imperfect verb, had a simpler meaning: *πρωτός μου* can simply mean “my superior” while the verb may be only copulative, a truth that “is and always has been the same,” as it is used in Aristotle’s *τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι* (cf. *Metaphysics* 1029b; 1035b)—what it *already was*, not what it *used to be* (*Tradition*, 274). This works well in the context of John 1:30, although the form of the statement does allow a temporal reading toward which more weight is shifted in the final reformulation of 1:15.

⁵³ In 1:29, including historical presents, John *sees* (βλέπει) Jesus *coming* (ἐρχόμενον) and *says* (λέγει) to behold the Lamb who *takes away* (αἴρων) sins. More importantly in 1:30, this *is* (ἐστίν) the man whom he said (aorist) *is coming* (ἔρχεται). A perfect verb (γέγονεν) intervenes specifically in reference to Jesus, but it seems to have present force (“he has become” in the sense of “he is”). One might also compare the use of “to be” verbs in dialogue the previous day: εἰμί is used three times, εἶ is used five. The only imperfect form (ἦσαν, 1:24) is given from the narrator’s retrospective viewpoint (they *were* sent). Van den Heever does not address the shift in verb tense.

⁵⁴ Would “He *is* before me” seem to point too heavily to status?

⁵⁵ Keener, *John*, 1:457 (see also above, n. 45). Origen (*Comm. Io.* 1.32.236-39) argues that “one comes after me” points to the fact that Jesus is six months younger than John, as in Luke, but does not address “because he was before me” in this context (similarly Köstenberger, *John*, 45, without citing Origen). It is not entirely clear that John or his audience would have the traditions found in Luke 1-2 in mind.

⁵⁶ J.A.T. Robinson, “Elijah, John, and Jesus: An Essay in Detection,” *NTS* 4/4 (1958): 263-81, and Brown, *John*, 1:47-64.

John's assertion of Jesus' temporal priority in this way only because we have been conditioned to by the prologue, not exclusively due to the phrasing that John uses in 1:30.

The context of a prologue is very different than a passage within the story. The prologue breaks beyond the temporal confines of the story, here into the primordial past and into the story world's future (the audience's present). Both extensions are important since, while it describes extremely early events, the prologue itself is retrospective, spoken from a post-resurrection perspective. It looks back on all of the events of the gospel as past events. The first interruption regarding John the Baptist (1:6-8) is told retrospectively even though he has yet to appear in the story: there *came to be* (ἐγένετο) a person; he *came* (ἦλθεν) to testify; he *was not* (οὐκ ἦν) the Light.⁵⁷ This interruption follows the many statements regarding the Word and what it *was* (6x in John 1:1-5), and so establishes the Word's narrative as well as existential priority. The retrospection continues and culminates in a reference to the incarnation of the Word (1:14): the Word *became* (ἐγένετο) flesh and *dwelt* (ἐσκήνωσεν) among us, and we *saw* (εἶθεασάμεθα) his glory. This last claim especially has yet to happen in the narrative—arguably it cannot

⁵⁷ This last statement, that John was not the Light, when paired with the many positive statements regarding what Jesus *was* (in the beginning, with God, God, in the beginning with God, the true Light, in the world) will be balanced in the present tense within the story by John's several "I am not" statements (1:20, 21, 27; 3:28) that are far outmatched by the many statements about who Jesus *is*, whether made by him (the predicated "I am" statements, including the Light [8:12] which is *in the world* [9:5]) or confessional statements about him (1:30, 33, 34, 49; 3:2; 4:19, 42; 6:14, 69; 7:40-41; 9:17, 24; 11:27).

happen until after the crucifixion,⁵⁸ but at the soonest not until after the first sign (cf.

2:11)⁵⁹—yet from the prologue’s perspective it is referred to as a completed past event.⁶⁰

The retrospective context of the prologue helps to explain certain modifications to John’s self-citation regarding the one coming after him: “this *is* the one” in 1:30 becomes “this *was* the one” in 1:15,⁶¹ distancing the prologue from the narrative presentation *en scène*.⁶² In the context of 1:27, the one coming after the Baptist identifies the one stand-

⁵⁸ As late as John 17:24 Jesus wishes that the disciples *may see* (θεωρᾶσιν) his glory.

⁵⁹ John 2:11 reads, “Jesus did this in Cana of Galilee as the beginning of his signs, and he *manifested his glory*, and his disciples believed in him.” That the disciples perceived his glory at the time is unlikely.

⁶⁰ This is the result of the prologue being dominated by the narrator’s post-resurrection perspective, evident elsewhere in the narrative asides in which the narrator can refer to the anointing (11:2), the resurrection (2:22), and the giving of the Spirit (7:39) as past events even though they have yet to happen in the story (Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 27-32).

⁶¹ An ancient and strongly attested variant of 1:15 (κ^a, B*, C*, Origen, and Cyril of Alexandria) replaces ὃν εἶπον with ὁ εἰπὼν (J. Ramsay Michaels, “Origen and the Text of John 1:15,” in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis* [eds. E.J. Epp and G.D. Fee; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981], 87-104). The variant is troublesome grammatically, and previous translations have treated the introductory phrase as a parenthetical comment: “John testifies about him and has cried out, saying—this was he who said—‘The one coming after me...’” Who else might have said it is not entirely clear. Michaels argues persuasively that, with the variant reading, the *entire speech act of 1:15* should be taken as a parenthetical comment so that the λέγων preceding the DIQ connects to the ὅτι in 1:16: “John testifies about him and has cried out, saying—he it was who said, ‘The one coming after me has taken precedence over me because he existed before me’—‘Of his fullness we have all received, and grace for grace’.” Michaels’ reading is strengthened by the fact that patristic attestations of the variant only occur in arguments that John’s testimony continues at least through verse 16. For our purposes, the variant formula continues to introduce who Jesus *was* and the speech act as something John *said* (in the aorist, whether εἶπον or εἰπὼν).

⁶² Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 102. Michaels (“Text of John 1:15,” 101-2) notes that ἦν is used eleven times in the prologue, yet ἐστίν never is. However, he argues that the use of “was” weighs against the majority reading because “it implies that the Baptist now looks back on the historical career of Jesus from *his* later perspective—whatever that might be!” Two objections arise. First, the Baptist’s career continues well into that of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel; one could easily imagine this line inserted between 3:27 and 3:28 without a hiccup. Second, 1:15 comes in the context of a retrospective look at the incarnation of Jesus (cf. 1:14), yet in which the Baptist still testifies (through the gospel?). Certainly Jesus still exists and still lives after the resurrection, so that there is *continuity* between his earthly life and the risen Lord. That does not completely erase the *discontinuity* between the incarnate Word living as a man in the world, and the risen Lord spiritually present in the church but no longer here in the flesh, so to speak.

ing among them whom they do not know (1:26).⁶³ In 1:30, it is simply that a man is presently approaching. But in the prologue, the Word provides the only masculine antecedent (besides God!) if one is required, tying the Baptist's statement directly back to the opening verses which focus on the preexistence of the now incarnated Word in the strongest possible terms.⁶⁴ If the Messiah, Elijah, and the Prophet give possible models of pre-existence in the context of John's testimony before priests and Levites *in the story*, the proleptic quotation of John's testimony *in the prologue* escalates the claim to one of the absolute preexistence of the Word, identified with Jesus (1:17), and so indicates his absolute pre-eminence over John the Baptist.

In the prologue John constructs a hybrid form of the Baptist's testimony, taking "the one coming after me" from 1:27 and the rest from 1:30.⁶⁵ The ambiguity of the initial title allows identification with the preexistent Word, while the allowance of temporal priority in the final clause amplifies the identification. The prologue, including

⁶³ The glut of possible roles that John might fulfill in 1:25 (Christ, Elijah, the Prophet) seems to militate against identifying "the coming one" neatly with any one of them, although a case could be made for all three: the gospel takes a strong position that Jesus is the Christ (1:41; 4:25-30; 11:27; 20:31), and again see Brown, *John*, 1:47-64 on the possibility that the Baptist thinks of Jesus as Elijah; see also Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup 14; Boston: Brill, 1967) for the ways that John presents Jesus as the Prophet like Moses.

⁶⁴ Although ὁ ἐρχόμενος is a loaded term on its own, it is still masculine while the Light (τὸ φῶς) that was coming (ἦν ἐρχόμενον, if nominative) into the world is neuter (early source critical studies of the prologue posited that the Light shown on "every man coming into the world" [πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον], which may then connect to the ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος in 1:6 referring to the Baptist; for a refutation of this position, see Peder Borgen, "Logos Was the True Light: Contributions to the Interpretation of the Prologue of John," in *Logos Was the True Light and Other Essays on the Gospel of John* [Relieff 9; Trondheim: Tapir, 1983], 95-110). Jesus will later self-identify as the Light of the world, at least so long as he is *in the world* (9:5; cf. 8:12).

⁶⁵ Haenchen, *John*, 1:120. See also chapter 2 n. 21 on this rarer type of paraphrase. Thyen (*Johannes-evangelium*, 101) sees in the phrasing of 1:15 already the first case of an intertextual play on the Synoptic texts that is signaled more strongly in 1:27.

John's specific testimony, conditions the reader to infer temporal priority in a way that the traditional logion simply could not. By contrast the Synoptic presentations of the Baptist, including their own versions of the saying, unpack the greater status of Jesus by comparing their baptisms, one with water and one with the Holy Spirit.⁶⁶ By the time the Baptist gives his testimony about the one coming after him on the first day in John, echoing the language of the first clause of 1:15 exactly, the audience already knows *why* the Baptist is unworthy to loosen his sandal. Such an audience is privileged over the priests and Levites who lack this information. When John returns to this testimony again on the second day, now echoing the second and third clauses exactly, it is even harder for the privileged audience not to hear a confession of Jesus' preexistence. The series of quotations masks John's interpretive redirection of the saying, framing a statement (almost certainly traditional) regarding Jesus' status, far superior to that of John the Baptist, in the context of Christ's absolute preexistence—a christological insight that only John among the gospels is so explicit in promoting.

The Fourth Gospel places great emphasis on the testimony of the Baptist, and while some of it is unique to John (e.g. "the Lamb of God"), everything that the Baptist quotes or can be quoted as saying has ties to pre-Johannine tradition. The same cannot be said for the rest of the quotations in the gospel, but as we will see, many are grounded in tradition. From here on until we get to those quotations tied to Mark 9:1, we will skip through the gospel to trace the traditions behind much of John's quoted material.

⁶⁶ See Edmondo Lupieri, *Giovanni Battista fra storia e leggenda* (Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 53; Brescia: Paideia, 1988), 137; Keener, *John*, 1:456. The Fourth Gospel presents a similar but somewhat confused model of the two baptisms (cf. 3:26; 4:1-2).

You Blaspheme; I Am God's Son (John 10:36)

We can begin with a simpler case: Jesus' double citation of hostile Jews ("You blaspheme") and of himself ("I am God's Son," 10:36). The Dedication scene (John 10:22-39) echoes loudly Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin in the Synoptics:⁶⁷

Table 8. The Synoptic Sanhedrin Trial and John's Dedication Scene

| Synoptic Parallel before the Sanhedrin | John's Dedication Scene |
|--|--|
| "If you are the Messiah, tell us." ⁶⁸ | "If you are the Messiah, tell us openly." |
| "If I tell you, you will not believe." ⁶⁹ | "I told you, and you did not believe." |
| "So then you are the Son of God?" ⁷⁰ | "...because I said, 'I am God's Son'?" |
| "You heard the blasphemy!" ⁷¹ | "Do you say, 'you blaspheme'..." |
| All condemned him as deserving of death. ⁷² | The Jews picked stones again to stone him. |

The similarities are striking. Whether John draws on the Synoptic accounts directly or, as Brown suggests, more accurately reflects the historical recollections of the disciples that underlie them, it is very likely that John draws on traditional material here.⁷³

⁶⁷ Built on Brown, "Incidents."

⁶⁸ Luke 22:67 is closest to John 10:24, which only adds *παρρησία*. Mark 14:61 has the high priest ask, "Are you the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One?" Matt 26:63 has, "I adjure you... to tell us if you are the Messiah, the Son of God," so there is already a conflation of Messiah and Son language in the tradition.

⁶⁹ Luke 22:67 is closest to John 10:25. On the responses in Matthew and Mark, see below.

⁷⁰ The line comes from Luke 22:70, absent in Mark and Matthew who have Son language in the original question. However, compare especially Matt 27:43: "Let God deliver him if he wants him, for he said, 'I am God's Son'!"

⁷¹ Luke does not mention blasphemy, but both Mark 14:64 and Matt 26:65 have the exclamation.

⁷² Again taken from Mark 14:64 and Matt 26:65, absent in Luke. Cp. also John 10:39, "So they were seeking to seize him again."

⁷³ For John dependent on Mark and perhaps other Synoptic tradition, see Barrett, *John*, 378-79 and Lincoln, *John*, 37. Luke and at least one of the other Synoptics would seem to be necessary if this is the case. For

It is not difficult to see why the material would be attractive to John, whatever its source. The focus on present testimony and past speech is pervasive: the Jews want Jesus to testify plainly that he makes messianic claims, and he counters that he has already testified to this. In light of the novel interpretation of Psalm 82, Jesus addresses the charge of blasphemy while also testifying that he himself has claimed to be God's Son. Incorporating the material here allows John to expand the lawsuit motif several months and eight chapters prior to the trial. Presenting the two statements as quotations allows the Fourth Gospel to have Jesus not only testify to his own divine sonship in a direct manner, but also to testify against the Jews in the gospel's counter-suit against them.

I Am the Jews' King (John 19:21)

Speaking of material tied to the Synoptic passion narratives, John 19:21 presents the chief priests of the Jews quoting Jesus as saying, "I am the Jews' King." This title is applied to Jesus repeatedly in each of the now-canonical gospel traditions, and in all cases it appears on the epigraph of the cross.⁷⁴ In fact, prior to the quotation from the chief priests, each of John's uses of the title has at least one parallel in the Synoptic passion narratives:

John 18:33: [Pilate]: "Are you the King of the Jews?"
(cf. Mark 15:2 // Matt 27:11 // Luke 23:3)

John 18:39: [Pilate]: "Do you want me to release the King of the Jews to you?"
(cf. Mark 15:9)

Brown's argument, see "Incidents," 152 or *John*, 1:405. Another possibility would be that John had access to one of the Synoptic tradition's passion sources.

⁷⁴ In the *Gospel of Peter* 11 the inscription reads instead, "This is the King of Israel."

John 19:3: [Soldiers]: “Hail to the King of the Jews!”
(cf. Mark 15:18 // Matt 27:29)

John 19:19: [the *titulus*]: “Jesus the Nazorean, the King of the Jews.”
(cf. Mark 15:26 // Matt 27:37 // Luke 23:38)⁷⁵

John’s unique contribution is the request to change the phrasing:

John 19:21: “Do not write, ‘The King of the Jews’ (cf. Mark 15:26), but, ‘He said, “I am the Jews’ King”’.”

The direct quote is in the mode of an imputed accusation, and there is additional Johannine resonance. So far the Jews have disputed with Jesus when he claimed, “I am the bread” (6:41-42), “...the light” (8:12), “...the gate” (10:9), “...the good shepherd” (10:11, 14; cf. 10:20), and “...God’s Son” (10:36). Although the reactions to his declarations of, “I am” without a predicate have been mixed (see the reactions to 8:24 and 8:28),⁷⁶ the last of these inspired an attempted lynching (8:58). “I am the Jews’ King” sounds like something Jesus would say, making the imputation more believable. To be more specific, “I am the Jews’ King” sounds like something Jesus would say *in the Gospel of John*! The original statements with this title are phrased in traditional language; the quotation is Johannine and serves to further characterize the Jews (through their chief priests) as those who bring evidence against Jesus. The Fourth Gospel is evidently keen

⁷⁵ Notice that Mark appears throughout, leading Barrett to claim that John “follows Mark closely” here (*John*, 536). The precise wording of the epigraph in the Synoptics varies. Mark’s reads only, “The King of the Jews.” Luke adds “this one” to the end of Mark’s phrase, while Matthew’s reads more fully and confessionally, “This is Jesus, the King of the Jews.”

⁷⁶ In the second case (8:28), Jesus has just mentioned the Son of Man so the second clause could be read, “you will know that I am *he*.” In the first case, Jesus has just said, “You are from below, I am from above (ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμὶ); you are of this world, I am not (ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ) of this world” (8:23). The statement in 8:24 could be an elliptic reference back to these “I am” statements: “unless you believe that I am [from above/not of this world].” However we read them, in chapter 8 alone Jesus makes six bold declarations using ἐγὼ εἰμὶ while under the eye of the chief priests (cf. 7:32, 45).

to emphasize the title, King of the Jews,⁷⁷ and DIQ allows John to repeat it twice more while slipping in an additional (and ironically true) “I am,” even if Pilate will not concede to modify the *titulus*.

I Am (John 18:5, 6, 8)

Speaking also of “I am” statements in the passion narrative, let us take a brief moment on the double-quotation of Jesus’ seemingly banal response at his arrest. It is dangerous to load too much onto just two words that serve as a self-identification, yet there is a tradition pre-dating John of having Jesus boldly declare who he is using these two words. The declaration appears in all accounts of Jesus walking on the water (Mark 6:50; Matt 14:27; John 6:20), where there are perhaps some echoes of the divine use of “I am” in Exodus and deuterio-Isaiah.⁷⁸ An even more relevant case is found in Mark’s trial before the Sanhedrin where, unlike in Matthew and Luke, Jesus answers the question of whether he is the Messiah quite plainly (14:62): “I am.”⁷⁹ The cluster of Synoptic parallels in John 10 is connected to precisely this scene, so that John seems to be aware of either the Synoptic trial material or the traditions behind it. Like Mark, the Fourth Gospel has Jesus boldly declare his identity to his enemies at his arrest. However in John where Jesus has already admitted publically to claiming he is God’s Son (cf. 5:17; 10:22-39),

⁷⁷ Caragounis (“Kingdom of God,” 125) points out that John presents Jesus as “king” 14 times, while Matthew comes closest to John with eight.

⁷⁸ These echoes are perhaps louder in Mark, where Jesus intends to “pass them by” (Mark 6:48), a possible allusion to God’s activity on Sinai (Hooker, *Mark*, 170). These echoes are still heard in John’s version, however. For other significant Synoptic uses of “I am” by Jesus, see Matt 18:20; 28:20; cp. also the declarations of deceivers in Mark 13:6 // Matt 24:5 // Luke 21:8.

⁷⁹ Jesus does follow this up with a declaration about seeing the Son of Man. Luke has Jesus answer, “You say that *I am*” (cp. John 18:37), which is found in a few manuscripts of Mark beginning in the 9th century most likely by assimilation to Luke (Hooker, *Mark*, 361). Matt 26:64 has, “You said [so].”

instead of a deceptive kiss by Judas to signify who Jesus is, *Jesus* asks the arresting officers whom they seek and confesses it without provocation.

The echoes of deutero-Isaiah, particularly its use of the divine “I am,” are significantly louder in the Fourth Gospel.⁸⁰ There are signs of insertion in the arrest scene just at the point that Jesus identifies himself as Jesus the Nazorean with ἐγώ εἰμι (18:5).⁸¹ It is possible that one might hear the divine title here, but the narrator takes no chances: a note intrudes that when Jesus said, “I am,” he knocked a large crowd of soldiers to the ground (18:6), turning a simple identification into a demonstration of the power of the divine epithet when Jesus speaks it. Finally Jesus quotes himself, creating a triple affirmation of “I am” in the arrest scene.⁸²

It Is Better for One Person to Die for the People (John 11:50-52; 18:14)

One more quotation that appears in the passion narrative seems to modify a traditional saying. Von Wahlde argues for a development in the prophetic saying given by Caiaphas from within the Johannine context:⁸³

Initial saying (1E, 11:50): “It is better for you that one person should die for the people (ὅπ᾽ ἓρ τοῦ λαοῦ) so that the whole nation should not perish.”

First development (2E, 18:14): “It is better that one person dies for the people (ὅπ᾽ ἓρ τοῦ λαοῦ).”

⁸⁰ See Ball, *‘I Am’ in John’s Gospel*.

⁸¹ On this, see von Wahlde, *John*, 2:747-50 and the survey by Frans Neirynck, “L’epanalepsis et la critique littéraire: À propos de l’évangile de Jean,” *ETL* 56/4 (1980): 303-38.

⁸² It might also be worth noting the triple repetition, twice through DIQ, of the phrase spoken to Paul in Acts, “I am Jesus (the Nazorean), whom you are persecuting/prosecuting (ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς [ὁ Ναζωραῖος] ὃν σὺ διώκεις, Acts 9:5; 22:8; 26:15).

⁸³ 1E refers to the first edition of John, etc.

Second development (3E, 11:51-52): “Jesus was about to die for the nation (ὕπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους), and not for the nation alone (οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον), but also so the scattered children of God might be gathered into one.”

Although 18:14 is simpler and almost proverbial, the modifications in 11:51-52 incorporate more of the specific Johannine context and language, particularly “children of God” (cf. John 1:12; 1 John 3:1, 10; 5:2). But does the original show signs of being traditional outside of its apparent development within John?

There are a number of ὑπὲρ-sayings applied to Jesus in the New Testament. In Paul’s early phrasing of the Eucharist tradition, a tradition he says he received (1 Cor 11:23), Jesus refers to the bread as “my body which is *for* (ὕπὲρ) you” (1 Cor 11:24).⁸⁴ Elsewhere Paul says that Christ died *for* our sins (Gal 1:4; 1 Cor 15:3, also received), *for* us (Rom 5:8; cp. Gal 3:13), or *for* all (2 Cor 5:14; cf. also Heb 2:9). In the Markan account of the institution of the Eucharist, Jesus refers to the wine as “my blood of the covenant, poured out *for* many” (Mark 14:24).⁸⁵ John’s most Eucharistic passage incorporates this language when Jesus says he will give his flesh *for* the life of the world (6:51), suggesting that whoever composed this line was aware of the wider tradition.⁸⁶ So ὑπὲρ-sayings applied to Jesus’ death are widespread in Pauline circles, where Paul marks some of them as traditions that he himself received, and evident also in the Synoptic tradition.

⁸⁴ Luke’s phrasing is nearly identical to Paul’s, with the addition of “given” (cf. Luke 22:19). The Coptic adds, “given” to 1 Cor 11:24 in the same position as Luke.

⁸⁵ Matt 26:28 substitutes περὶ πολλῶν. For a more complete discussion, see Reimund Bieringer, “Traditionsgeschichtlicher Ursprung und theologische Bedeutung der *hyper*-Aussagen im Neuen Testament,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. F. van Segbroeck; 3 vols.; Louvain: Peeters, 1992), 1:219-48.

⁸⁶ In addition, see 10:11, 15; 13:37-38; 15:13, all of which speak of laying down one’s life *for* someone.

As to the various groups for which Jesus dies, Pancaro's discussion is helpful. He argues, based on usage in the LXX and NT, that λαός connotatively refers to the Jewish people as the people of God, while ἔθνος refers to any nation. Yet in the NT and the early church fathers, λαός is applied more and more to Christ-followers as the new "people of God." In Pancaro's reading, the use of λαός is part of Caiaphas' inadvertent prophecy:

St. John is playing on the word λαός. "Jesus will die for the λαός." Caiaphas meant the Jewish nation, but he said "the λαός." He thus prophesied. Jesus would indeed die for the Jewish nation, but not only for the Jewish nation. His death would have a much broader scope... Without realizing it he prophesied that Jesus would die not to save the nation from destruction by the Romans, but for the people of God (λαός). As a result of this, although the nation would indeed be destroyed, not all the nation (ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος) would perish.⁸⁷

This allows us to speculate further. The Johannine tradition may have received something like Caiaphas' statement in 11:50 (or more likely 18:14), that Jesus would die *instead of* the (Jewish) people. When most members of the church were still Jewish, and indeed still part of the synagogue, the similarity of this sentiment to other ὑπέρ-sayings allowed a double-hearing: Jesus died *for* the (Jewish) people, i.e. for *us*. However, as more Gentiles joined, or perhaps as the Johannine groups grew more distant from the synagogue, some commentary became necessary. At some point the rather verbose reinterpretation of 11:51-52 is developed to reflect the new application that the Jewish people have become a nation like any other, and that Jesus died not only for the believers from that particular

⁸⁷ Pancaro, "People of God," 122.

nation (Peter and the rest of the Twelve among them), but so that *all* the scattered believers, all children of God, may be gathered together as one.⁸⁸

The Son of Man Must Be Lifted Up (John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32-34)

The notion of Jesus being “lifted up” appears in three scenes in John (3:14; 8:28; 12:32-34). The first uses the bronze serpent that Moses lifted up as an analogy for the Son of Man, who must also be lifted up so that whoever sees him and believes in him may have eternal life (3:14). If the *Epistle of Barnabas* is independent of John as it seems, then its presentation of the serpent as a “type of Christ” (12:5-6) gives evidence that John begins by incorporating a traditional comparison.⁸⁹ But by repeating the motif three times, John goes beyond it. These three sayings play a role similar to Mark’s three passion predictions (8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34) although John’s Jesus uses the polyvalent ὑψώω,⁹⁰ encapsulating both being lifted up physically on the cross (cf. 12:33) and being

⁸⁸ A similar move seems to be made in Rev 21:3 (see Edmondo Lupieri, *A Commentary on the Apocalypse of John* [trans. M.P. Johnson and A. Kamesar; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006], 331-32). An objection might be made that the verb used, συνάγω, is linked to συναγωγή, and therefore we might look for more of an intra-Jewish phenomenon. But if John is in fact appropriating “people” for the new body of believers, it may do the same with “synagogue” (cp. also in Johannine circles Rev 3:9, which differentiates other Jews as “*Satan’s* synagogue,” apparently as distinct from a more proper synagogue, i.e. the church). Such a use of Jewish terminology does not preclude the presence of Gentiles within the body of believers.

⁸⁹ Brown, *John*, 1:133.

⁹⁰ Barnabas Lindars, “Discourse and Tradition: The Use of the Sayings of Jesus in the Discourse of the Fourth Gospel,” *JSNT* 13 (1981): 83-101, here 86-87. Pierre Létourneau (“Le Quatrième Évangile et les prédications de la passion dans les Évangiles Synoptiques,” in *John and the Synoptics* [BETL 101; ed. A. Denaux; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992], 579-86, here 581) traces the matter differently: the Synoptics focus on the *subjective* conditions of salvation, with each prediction leading into the suffering required also of disciples, while John focuses on the *objective* condition of salvation, i.e. the crucifixion and exaltation of Christ. Acts twice refers to the exaltation of Jesus using ὑψώω (Acts 2:33; 5:31), the former as distinct from the crucifixion (cf. 5:30): “you killed [him] by hanging [him] on a tree... God exalted (ὑψωσεν) him.”

exalted.⁹¹ The three Markan passion predictions use more definite terms like *suffer*, *die*, *be crucified*, and in three days *rise up*. Still, as Pierre Létourneau tracks it, there are similarities: each triplet involves the Son of Man,⁹² the first prediction always expresses the necessity (δεῖ) of the crucifixion (and, I would add, the second and third refer to it as a certain and imminent but *future* event),⁹³ and each implicates Jewish authorities.⁹⁴ So it is not only the triple prediction of Jesus' death that connects John's "lifted up" sayings to the Synoptic tradition; there are similarities of form and content as well. In this manner, the Fourth Gospel can incorporate the image of the bronze serpent (and thus expand on its Prophet-like-Moses motif)⁹⁵ and yet another echo of Isaiah (where God's servant will be lifted up [ὕψωθήσεται] and glorified exceedingly [δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα])⁹⁶ while building a proper set of passion predictions off of a polyvalent term.

⁹¹ Brown (*John*, 1:146), based partially on the uses of ὑψώω in Acts, includes the ascension as part of Jesus' "lifting up" in John. Brown also recognizes the similarities to Mark.

⁹² Matthew's first passion prediction (16:21) does not mention the Son of Man; instead it reports in the third person that *he* (Jesus) must suffer, etc. Likewise, in John's third "lifted up" saying Jesus uses direct speech in the first person, "If *I* am lifted up" (12:32). The crowd, however, quickly 'corrects' him with a quotation involving the Son of Man (12:34). In Johannine fashion, they are ironically correct that Jesus, the Son of Man, and the Messiah can all be identified.

⁹³ Futures appear in Mark 9:31 and 10:33; Matt 17:22-23 and 20:18-19; and Luke 18:31-33. Luke 9:44 says that the Son of Man "is about to be handed over" (μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι). John uses a subjunctive in 8:28 ("whenever you lift up"), but notes that "*then* you *will* know" (τότε γνώσεσθε). A conditional appears in 12:32 ("if I should be lifted up"), but is again followed by a future: "I *will* draw (ἐλκύσω) everyone."

⁹⁴ Létourneau, "Les predications," 579.

⁹⁵ Moses is not a type of Christ as much as the bronze serpent is (Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 292), but John is not so neat in his analogy and intends a comparison nonetheless. Instead of Moses lifting a bronze serpent up to save people temporarily, Jesus will allow (cause?) himself to be lifted up to save people eternally (see Mardaga, "Repetitive Use of ὑψώω," 112-13). Cp. Heb 9:1-14, where Jesus is both the sacrifice and the high priest.

⁹⁶ See Lincoln, *John*, 153.

Since L  tourneyau ignores the quotation in John 12:34, he misses that there may also be some light criticism of the Synoptic tradition’s focus on the physical suffering of Jesus, which portrays the crucifixion much more as a humiliation that Christ endures than as his moment of exaltation where his glory is manifested, as John does.⁹⁷ The crowd that quotes him (12:34) is probably hostile and definitely misunderstands Jesus by reducing the meaning of “lifted up” to death alone. This same crowd inexplicably (at the story level) quotes the prediction *closest to the Synoptic tradition*.⁹⁸ John may want not only to import aspects of Jesus’ glorification into the crucifixion while downplaying Christ’s suffering; it may also view the failure to do so as misleading in itself.

A Slave Is not Greater than His Master (John 13:16; 15:20)

We can now leave the passion behind and look for other sorts of material that John has incorporated using DIQ. After the footwashing scene, Jesus begins a short discourse explaining what he has just done to the disciples. Jesus affirms the titles of “teacher” (διδάσκαλος) and “master” (κύριος) by which the disciples address him (13:13): “and you speak rightly, for I am.”⁹⁹ He then interprets the footwashing as a

⁹⁷ L  tourneyau does recognize the elimination of kenotic elements in the Johannine passion predictions and ably describes how John’s christological foci (but not its literary tendencies) lead to very different predictions. He simply does not recognize how the crowd’s quotation re-focuses the complex on Jesus’ death and presumed absence to the detriment of all other aspects, such as salvation (John 3:14), deeper Christological knowledge (8:28-29), and Jesus’ ability to draw people to himself (12:32).

⁹⁸ John’s second and third predictions have more complex structures than those in the Synoptic tradition, where definite statements about what the Son of Man will suffer are given. However, the words δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου appear in the first prediction of Mark, Luke, and John, and in the crowd’s quotation. The infinitives in the Synoptics follow these words since they give way to a list of things that will happen to the Son of Man. For more on the placement of the infinitive in John, see chapter 2 above.

⁹⁹ Cp. John 8:48. There is a sort of DIQ here: the disciples have addressed him as “teacher” (cf. 11:28; for “rabbi,” interpreted as “teacher,” see 1:38, 49; 4:31; 9:2; 11:8) and “lord” (cf. 6:68; 11:3, 12, 21, 27, 32, 39; and Peter here twice, 13:6, 9).

mimetic example for them to follow: if he has washed their feet, then they should wash one another's (13:14). Jesus has given them a model (ὑπόδειγμα) so that "just as (καθὼς) I did to you, you should also do" (13:15). The string of mimetic material is concluded with a double amen:

John 13:16: "Amen, amen I say to you, a slave is not greater than his master (οὐκ ἔστιν δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ), nor is one who is sent (ἀπόστολος) greater than the one who sent him."

Another double amen regarding the relationship between the sender and the sent appears soon after: "the one who receives the one I send receives me, and the one who receives me receives the one who sent me" (13:20).

The slave/master saying seems to be traditional both in its formulation and in its parallel construction. A similar master-slave comparison appears in Matthew:

Matt 10:24-25: "A student is not above the teacher, nor is a slave above his master (οὐδὲ δοῦλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ).¹⁰⁰ It is sufficient that the student become like his teacher and the slave like his master."

To say the least there is evidence in Matthew that the master-slave comparison may pre-date John.¹⁰¹ The teacher-student comparison also appears in Luke's sermon on the plain (6:40),¹⁰² while the additional comparison ("it is sufficient that the slave become like his

¹⁰⁰ The phrase in question is absent in OL *k* and the Sinaitic Syriac, "a formidable combination" according to Dodd (*Tradition*, 335). However, it is universally present in the Greek tradition. If there is harmonization with another text, it would be simpler if the master-slave comparison was omitted in imitation of Luke (6:40) than that it was added to Matthew in imitation of John, but in reverse order and with modified, Synoptic phrasing. If the latter was indeed the case, it was done very early.

¹⁰¹ If John is directly dependent on Matthew, John replaces Matthew's (and Luke's) ὑπὲρ with its preferred comparative μείζων (Jesus and Jacob, 4:12; Jesus and Abraham, 8:53; the Father and Jesus, 14:28). See Lincoln, *John*, 36.

¹⁰² The occurrence of the teacher-student comparison in Matthew and Luke has led to its inclusion in the reconstructed Q, although without the master-slave parallel found in Matthew (Robinson, et al, *Critical*

master”) appears in several rabbinic passages.¹⁰³ Although these passages are late (7th century or later), it does not seem particularly likely that the rabbis, who treat the phrase as proverbial, adopted it from Matthew or Jesus (or some later Christian re-working of the motif)—although it is always possible. Instead, if the phrase was already proverbial at the time of the evangelists (not to mention Jesus), then it may have given rise to the corollary that the slave is not above/greater than the master.

Furthermore, there are other traditional elements in the construction of the double amen in 13:16. First, similar comparisons of the sender and the sent appear even more often in the Talmud and as early as the Mishnah.¹⁰⁴ Again they are not ascribed to a particular rabbi, but presented as a proverbial truth. Second, we can see from Matthew that a parallel construction has already been used with this sort of comparison, whether

Edition of Q, 78). Gilbert van Belle and David R. M. Godecharle (“C.H. Dodd on John 13:16 (and 15:20): St. John’s Knowledge of Matthew Revisited,” in *Engaging with C.H. Dodd on the Gospel of John: Sixty Years of Tradition and Interpretation* [eds. T. Thatcher and C.H. Williams; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013], 86-106, here 98) use its absence in the reconstructed Q to support John’s direct dependence on Matthew. Theobald (*Herrenworte*, 139-45) finds it more likely that the parallelism already appeared in Q and that Luke has omitted it. See also Edwin K. Broadhead, “The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Sayings Source: The Relationship Reconsidered,” in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher, eds.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 291-301. Either possibility supports the point being made: if the phrase, embedded in a parallelism like Matthew’s, appeared in a document like Q even prior to the First Gospel, it only pushes back earlier the tradition that John may have relied upon.

¹⁰³ See *b. Ber.* 58b; *Sifra Lev.* 25:23 (per. 3, behar 4); *Exod. Rab.* 42.5 (on Exod 32:7). The last of these is notable: just as God descended to investigate the Tower of Babel, Moses must descend from Sinai to investigate the idolatry of the Golden Calf, “for it is sufficient that the slave be like his master.” *Tanch.* 23.79, 80 have similar sayings, and *Exod. Rab.* 25.6 (on Exod 16:4; cp. John 6:31) has a string of normal relationships that are *inverted* with God: typically the student carries the lantern for his teacher (cp. John 9:5), the slave washes his master (cp. John 13:1-11), puts on his master’s shoes (cp. John 1:27), carries his master (cp. 5:1-12), and guards his master (cp. John 17:12). For the teacher-student comparison, we might also mention LXX Ps 118:99: “I understood above (ὐπὲρ) all those who teach me (τοὺς διδάσκοντάς με) that/because (ὅτι) your testimonies are my care” (suggested by Walter Schmithals, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* [Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980], 87). Compare later, *Dial. Sav.* 139.11-14 (“‘The disciple resembling his teacher’.” This word she [Mary] spoke as a woman who knew the All). Luke has instead, “everyone who is fully trained will be like his teacher.”

¹⁰⁴ Here the comparison is that the one who is sent is like/equal to (and therefore not above/greater than) the one who sent him; see *m. Berakoth* 5.5; *B.M.* 96a; *Hag.* 10b; *Kid.* 14b; *Men.* 93b; and *Naz.* 12b.

John borrows directly from Matthew or not. In fact, an unrelated but similar construction appears in Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus* in the first decade of the second century:

2.23.16: "Then what if... it *is* possible for that which serves to be superior to what it serves (τὸ διακονοῦν κρεῖσσον εἶναι ἐκείνου ᾧ διακονεῖ): the horse to the rider, or the dog to the hunter, or the instrument to the player, or the attendants (ὑπηρέται) to the king (βασιλέως)?"¹⁰⁵

These notions are presented as absurd. Arrian's Epictetus presents a set of comparisons in parallel construction to make an ethical point (here that we are servants of purpose), just as John's Jesus does. It is not that John seems to be familiar with Arrian, only that we have three similar expressions of a general principle in variant language within a few decades of each other, with at least one case apparently independent of the others. So not only are the individual comparisons likely to pre-date John, but it may have inherited the construction of the saying in parallel form from its tradition, oral or otherwise.

There are also signs of tradition in the discourses served by John's use of the saying. H.F.D. Sparks tabulated several points of similarity between John and Matthew, including that John uses the noun *apostle* only here and Matthew uses it only in 10:2;¹⁰⁶ that Jesus talks about *sending* the disciples in Matt 10:16; that John follows the recitation

¹⁰⁵ My translation; Greek taken from the LCL. The last comparison has particular resonance in John (cf. 7:32, 45-46; 18:3, 12, 18, 22, 36; 19:6).

¹⁰⁶ Graydon F. Snyder argues unconvincingly that the term ἀπόστολος is used here as part of a larger criticism of Peter ("John 13:16 and the Anti-Petrinism of the Johannine Tradition," *BR* 16 [1971]: 5-15). His argument rests too strongly on the questionable assumption that the death and resurrection of Jesus is unimportant in John, and it ignores the several appearances of the risen Lord to the Beloved Disciple, which are not devalued but instead used to put him on equal footing with Peter and the Twelve. Luise Abramowski argues somewhat more convincingly that the term would contribute to a criticism of *Paul* ("Der Apostel von Johannes 13,16," *ZNW* 99/1 [2008]: 116-23), although the criticism would be quite subtle and depends on John's knowledge of either the Pauline letters (where "slave" and "apostle" are used abundantly in reference to Paul) or of Pauline communities who continued to talk about Paul in these terms, which is a distinct possibility.

of the logion with one about the persecution of the disciples (John 15:21), whereas Matthew precedes his version with a saying on the same topic (Matt 10:23); and that Matthew's Jesus concludes the speech with a logion about the one who receives the disciples receiving also Jesus (Matt 10:40), while John follows the first recitation with a similar statement (John 13:20).¹⁰⁷ Gardner-Smith soon countered, addressing Sparks' points one by one,¹⁰⁸ for example that Matthew's terms fit more neatly John's first discourse where Jesus has referred to himself specifically as teacher and master,¹⁰⁹ yet John inexplicably substitutes a different comparison (sender and sent); the vocabulary differs in almost every other parallel that Sparks finds, with similarities resting on synonymous words and phrases;¹¹⁰ and the hatred and persecution of the disciples is not in view in *John 13*, although they are in the later discourse.

It is possible that Sparks has pushed the parallels with Matthew alone beyond their capacity. As even Gardner-Smith admits, the use that Jesus makes of the master-slave comparison in John 15:20 is quite similar to the use made of it in Matt 10:24, placed alongside the teacher-student comparison. Jesus predicts his physical absence

¹⁰⁷ "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew: The Evidence of John 13,16 and 15,20," *JTS* 3/1 (1952): 58-61. Sparks was recently defended by van Belle and Godecharle, "C.H. Dodd on John 13:16 (and 15:20)."

¹⁰⁸ "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew," *JTS* 4/1 (1953): 31-35. See also Dodd, *Tradition*, 335-38.

¹⁰⁹ Dodd adds that "disciple," found in Matthew's parallel, is one of John's favorite words (78 times in the gospel, six more times before they leave the room), so the switch to "apostle" is highly uncharacteristic of John and unlikely to occur only because Matthew uses the term once 23 verses prior (*Tradition*, 337).

¹¹⁰ For example, Matthew uses ἀποστέλλω (10:16) and δέχομαι (10:41) while John uses πέμπω (13:16; 15:20) and λαμβάνω (13:20). It could be that John substituted synonyms that he preferred, or the differences could reflect different translations or traditions that developed in similar but variant ways. Dodd (*Tradition*, 336) points out that each of the comparative constructions in John 13:16 and Matt 10:24 translate מן גדול in the Septuagint (see LXX Gen 48:19 for μείζων + gen. and 2 Kgdms 13:15 for ὑπέρ + acc.), allowing separate Greek translations of a Semitic original.

from the disciples, in John because he is about to die and return to the Father, in Matthew because he is sending them out on a mission that foreshadows their roles after his death.¹¹¹ In Matthew the disciples will be persecuted and will have the Spirit of their Father to defend them when they are put on trial in councils and synagogues (Matt 10:17-20), just as in John the Advocate or Spirit of Truth, who comes from the Father, will testify on Jesus' behalf (John 15:26) when the disciples are cast out of synagogues and killed (16:2).¹¹² Jesus was persecuted, hated, and killed because he came from the Father and testified, and the disciples, who are not greater than he is, can expect the same. Matthew provides evidence that likely pre-dates the Fourth Gospel for using the logion to support such a connection between the earthly Jesus and the later disciples.

Meanwhile Luke's context is very different.¹¹³ Here the teacher-student logion is used as one of a series of mimetic charges to the apostles:¹¹⁴ "Just as (καθὼς) you wish people to do for you, do for them likewise" (ὁμοίως, Luke 6:31). The audience should not do the same (τὸ αὐτὸ) as sinners, who love only those who love them (6:32-34). If they love their enemies, do good, and lend expecting no return they will be sons of the Most High, who is also kind (6:35); i.e. they will be like their Father: "Be merciful just as

¹¹¹ Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 312-13.

¹¹² Keener (*John*, 2:1022) connects 15:26 to Mark 13:9-11, which is adapted in Matt 10:19-20.

¹¹³ Although the sermon contains the saying, "Blessed are you when people hate you and exclude you, insult you and cast out your name as evil on account of the Son of Man" (6:22), the persecution of the disciples is not its main focus.

¹¹⁴ Sparks notes that Matthew uses the term "apostle" only in 10:2, believing this to make a stronger case for John's familiarity with Matthew. However, Luke uses the term "apostle" of those Jesus has chosen (ἐκλεγμένοι) shortly before a similar logion (6:13; cp. John 13:18, "I know whom I have chosen [ἐξελέξαμην]") and five other times besides (9:10; 11:49; 17:5; 22:14; 24:10), making it more likely that, if it were dependent on the Synoptic gospels, John would be dependent on Luke for the term than Matthew.

(καθὼς) your Father is merciful” (6:36). They must be good teachers, since those who are trained will be like (ὡς) their teachers (6:40).¹¹⁵ They must be humble, acknowledging the log in their own eyes before the speck in someone else’s (6:41-42). In other words, Luke uses the logion as a call to ethical action based on mimetic principles and the teachings of Jesus whose words, if they call him “Lord,” they should follow (6:46). John likewise uses the logion in the service of ethical teaching based on mimetic principles the first time it appears.¹¹⁶ The Gospel of Luke shows that comparative statements like those found in John 13:16 were already used by Christ-followers in such a didactic setting.

John appropriates and endorses both applications of the saying: the call to ethical behavior through imitation of Jesus, and the call to endure persecution. It is not clear that John used or knew of Matthew and Luke directly, although there are ambiguous signs of this in the relevant passages. It is more certain that John’s uses of the saying incorporate two modes of application already evident in the tradition, and that John uses DIQ to repeat the saying and effectively to endorse both.

Rise, Carry Your Bed and Walk (John 5:8, 11-12)

The act that leads directly to the beginning of Jesus’ persecution is the healing of a sick man in Jerusalem on a Sabbath. Like each of the healings in John, Jesus enacts the miracle with a command:

¹¹⁵ Of Matthew, Luke, and John, Jesus is addressed as “teacher” most often in Luke and at least occasionally by people who are not his enemies (cf. Luke 7:40; 8:49; 9:38; 12:13; 21:7). That is, when the disciples are fully trained they will be like Jesus.

¹¹⁶ See Bennema, “Mimesis in John 13” and the literature he cites there. It is notable that each of the three mentions titles that Jesus is called: John “teacher” and “lord,” Luke “lord,” and Matthew “Beelzebul” by his enemies (Matt 10:25).

John 5:8: Jesus said to him, “Rise, carry your bed and walk (Ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει)!”

The command is repeated twice more through the testimony of the healed man. Jesus heals a paralytic with a similar command in Mark 2:1-12, a story picked up by Matthew (9:1-8) and Luke (5:17-26). Mark’s initial, hypothetical citation of the command comes the closest to John’s actual one:

Mark 2:9: “Which is easier to say to the paralytic, ‘Your sins are forgiven’? Or to say, ‘Rise and carry your bed and walk (Ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει)’?”

Seven words in Mark match John’s wording precisely, with only the addition of an extra “and.”¹¹⁷ Subsequently Jesus gives the command he posited a moment earlier:

Mark 2:10-11: “So you might know that the Son of Man has the authority to forgive sins on the earth”—he said to the paralytic, “I tell you, rise, carry your bed and go to your house!”¹¹⁸

In a stereotyped fashion, we are told that the paralytic immediately obeyed (Mark 2:12 and pars.), as we are in John (5:9). In Mark attention is repeatedly drawn to the phrase *as a speech act*, although not as testimony but as a demonstration of Jesus’ authority.

Repeated attempts have been made to demonstrate that John has modified Mark’s account.¹¹⁹ Such arguments point to more than the strikingly similar phrase. For example

¹¹⁷ Matthew and Luke contract the command in the first case, giving only, “Rise and walk!” That is, in the later Synoptics there is no mention of *carrying* at all until the actual command is given, where they each follow Mark’s structure even if they make some substitutions: Matthew (9:6) alters the command to rise to an aorist participle (ἐγερθεῖς), and changes κράβαττος to κλίνη. Luke (5:24) instead changes the command to carry to an aorist participle (ἄρας), and replaces κράβαττος with κλινίδιον.

¹¹⁸ The verbal similarity of the commands in John and Mark is evident in a later conflation that cites Jesus as saying in John 5:8, “Rise, carry your bed and *go to your house*” (Daniel B. Johnson, “A Neglected Variant in Gregory 33 (John V.8),” *NTS* 18/2 [1972]: 231-32).

in the Synoptics Jesus demonstrates his authority to forgive sins. In John, Jesus warns the man not to sin anymore (5:14), an issue that arises unexpectedly and is just as quickly dropped. In the Synoptics the healing is one of a string of controversy stories that culminate in a conspiracy to kill Jesus for violating the Sabbath (Mark 3:6 and pars.). In John, through the testimony of the man and of Jesus, the healing leads to the Jews seeking to kill Jesus (5:18). All of this is of course to ignore much that is different: John has a different location, reverses the social situation of the man (from a man with four friends who dig through a roof to get to Jesus, to a man who cannot even find anyone to shove him in a pool), and most importantly, alters the nature of the controversy.

It is unlikely that John and Mark happened upon such similar phrases coincidentally, but given both the similarities and differences in their accounts it is unclear whether John borrowed the command (and little else) from Mark or whether, as Gardner-Smith claims, the command traveled through oral tradition to both Gospels.¹²⁰ In either case, John incorporates a phrase that evidently preceded the Fourth Gospel, but develops it in a novel direction. In Mark, the command is used only in the service of demonstrating

¹¹⁹ E.g. B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London: MacMillan, 1926), 398; Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists* (New York: Henry Holt, 1933), 187-91, and his earlier "Sources and Method of the Fourth Evangelist," *HJ* 25 (1926): 115-30, with input from the other Synoptics. Frans Neirynck takes up the argument in "John 5,1-18 and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to P. Borgen," in *Evangelica II* (BETL 99; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 699-712, and D. Moody Smith (*John Among the Gospels: The Relationship in Twentieth-Century Research* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 21) is certain that John knows Mark, using this as an example of "the influence of Mark in non-Markan Johannine pericopes."

¹²⁰ Percival Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), 26; see also Duncan Derrett, "Why 'Bed'? (Mark 2.9d; John 5.8b)," *Bibbia e Oriente* 38/2 (1996): 111-16. That the command itself was memorable and could travel from text to text is evident in the conflation of John 5:8 with Mark 2:11 cited above (n. 117) or the conflation of Luke's command (5:23) with a similar one in Acts 3:6 (in 8, B, D, and the Sahidic). An intermediate position is that John crafted a miracle story from its own tradition but modelled the command on Mark's, whether to create what we might now call intertextual echoes or simply because the authors liked the sound of it and thought that they could build certain themes upon it (note the use of "raise" in the discourse, John 5:21).

Jesus' authority to forgive sins. Matthew and Luke can even eliminate the command to *carry*. In John carrying is half the point. The command to *rise* is eliminated since the Jews are initially unconcerned with the healing,¹²¹ and soon the bed is too because the focus is on the man's carrying and walking on the Sabbath. John grounds the miracle story in a recognizably traditional command, but uses quotations to shift focus to the gospel's own concerns: testimony regarding Sabbath violations in or around the temple.

If You Remain in My Word, You Will Truly Be My Disciples, and You Will Know the Truth, and the Truth Will Free You (John 8:31-33)

Theobald's case for the pre-Johannine tradition in John 8:31-32, based largely on Leroy, is not as strong as some of the others in terms of lexical parallels. Instead, Leroy's case rests on three arguments: 1) the saying is self-sufficient (it does not need the narrative context to function); 2) freedom is a theme found only here (8:31-36) in the Johannine writings;¹²² and 3) the explication of the saying does not match the wording of the logion itself, i.e. the saying speaks of the disciples remaining in the word while the

¹²¹ The healing may be included in "these things" that cause the Jews to persecute Jesus in 5:16, and Jesus presents the miracle as the issue in 7:21-23. However, the initial problem is the man carrying his bed (and the fact that Jesus *told* him to do so), and later that Jesus justifies the healing by claiming the same authority as God to work on the Sabbath. The healing remains an issue but much weight has been shifted to Jesus' words as the cause of his troubles.

¹²² As is widely noted elsewhere; cp. Lindars ("Discourse and Tradition," 91): "The word *ἐλεύθερος* and its cognates occur only here in the Fourth Gospel. It is foreign to John's diction. It thus seems likely that John has used it here rather unwillingly, and abandons it as soon as he has established the terms of reference which he needs for the subsequent argument. If this is so, there must have been a certain constraint upon him to use it in the first place... this constraint comes from his use of traditional material."

discourse speaks of the word finding room in the disciples (cf. 8:37).¹²³ This last point is hardly convincing given John's penchant for mutuality.¹²⁴

To these Theobald adds two more: first, that the image of the disciples attending to the words of their teacher derives from early Christian tradition, and second, that Jesus continues to adapt the saying as the Jews do, although not through DIQ: "If the Son frees you, you will be really free" (8:36).¹²⁵ In support of his first point, Theobald gives a pair of logia on the conditions of discipleship:

Luke 14:26-27: "If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother... and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple. Whoever does not carry his own cross and come after me cannot be my disciple."¹²⁶

The Johannine saying may have adapted this form from the tradition, while its content developed through interaction with ideas found in the works of Philo (e.g. *Prob.* 45-46: "those who live according to the law are free [ἐλεύθεροι], but the unerring law is right reason [ὀρθὸς λόγος]") and in James 1:25 ("Whoever looks intently into the perfect law of freedom [τῆς ἐλευθερίας] and continues [παραμείνας] in it..."). Theoretically, in response John substitutes Christ's word for the law.

¹²³ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 482-83 and Leroy, *Rätsel*, 68-72.

¹²⁴ Just see John 14:20: "On that day you will know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you."

¹²⁵ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 483. C. Hugo Zorilla, following Boismard and Lamouille, detects a chiasm in 8:31-36, where the original statement, its quotation, and Jesus' paraphrase appear in key positions: A. If you remain in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you will know the truth and the truth will free you; B. We are Abraham's offspring; C. We have never been enslaved to anyone; D. How is it you say, "You will become free"? C'. Everyone who commits sin is a slave to sin; B'. The slave does not remain in the household forever; the son remains forever; A'. If the Son frees you, you will be really free ("The Obedient Disciple: Agent of Liberation (John 8:31-32)," in *Freedom and Discipleship: Liberation Theology in Anabaptist Perspective* [ed. D.S. Schipani; Maryknoll: Orbis, 1989], 17-33, here 23).

¹²⁶ A version of the saying is found in Matt 10:37-38, although there such a person is not worthy (ἄξιος) of Jesus. Theobald also points to Rom 8:9 ("If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not his") for a saying with a comparable form to the Synoptic logion.

Yet all of this could be a novel insight of John's instead of a tradition incorporated into the gospel.¹²⁷ There are potential precedents to John's statement and the use made of it, but they may not be directly *Jesus* tradition. It is important to make two observations about the arguments that John is making in the context of the larger dialogue. The first is that the "Jews who believed" (8:31) respond to the logion by invoking Abraham as a point of contrast to the implication that they are not free (8:33): "We are *seed of Abraham* (σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ), and we have never been enslaved to anyone." Descent from Abraham will continue to be an issue (8:37-40, 53, 56-58): the "Jews who believed" claim descent is a matter of heredity while Jesus claims it is a matter of *behaving* like Abraham. This brings us to the second observation: initially Jesus counters their claim to be free with a mini-parable.¹²⁸

John 8:35-36: "The slave does not remain in the household (οἰκία) forever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα); the son remains forever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). So if the son frees you, you will be really free."

More than one scholar has seen here an allusion to Isaac and Ishmael, both descended from Abraham but one a recognized son and heir, the other merely a child of the slave, Hagar.¹²⁹ Ishmael is sent away from Abraham's household with his mother while Isaac

¹²⁷ Duncan Derrett's suggestion of Buddhist precedents, arguably incorporated to facilitate proselytizing in Buddhist regions, is intriguing and not impossible, but perhaps not the most likely background ("Oriental Sources for John 8,32-36?" *Bibbia e Oriente* 43/1 [2001]: 29-32). He admits to parallels just as close in the works of Philo and among the Stoics, the latter of which he rejects only because John is Jewish and "has never been accused of being a Stoic" (p. 31) Although Derrett notes several similarities with Paul (who, though Jewish, was evidently influenced by Stoicism), he does not consider that John might not be building on Stoic thought directly, but on *Pauline* thought because it suits John's narrative and theological goals and because Paul is an influential member of its own tradition.

¹²⁸ Lindars, *John*, 325; Dodd, *Tradition*, 380-82.

¹²⁹ E.g. Brown, *John*, 1:362; Barrett, *John*, 346; Zorrilla, "Obedient Disciple," 23.

remains in the household¹³⁰ of Abraham and in an everlasting (LXX Gen 17:7-8, 19, αἰώνιον) covenant with God.

It is possible that John is drawing on Pauline tradition here.¹³¹ In Paul's letter to the Galatians, the apostle is apparently dealing with fellow Christ-believers sent from Jerusalem (cf. Gal 2:12-14) who are attempting to impose circumcision on Gentile converts who wish to become "seed of Abraham."¹³² Paul uses the image of Isaac and Ishmael to highlight that physical descent is less important than recognition as an heir (Gal 4:21-5:1). Abraham was considered righteous because he believed (Gal 3:6-9), and only by emulating the patriarch, righteous not through the Law but through living by faith in the "seed" (who is Christ, Gal 3:15-18), will believers be saved and be "born according to the Spirit" (γεννηθεῖς κατὰ πνεῦμα) from the free woman (ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρης), Sarah, who corresponds to the Jerusalem above (ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ).

¹³⁰ John uses οἰκία in 8:35 (cf. also 4:53; 11:31; 12:3; 14:2) rather than οἶκος (cf. 2:16-17; 11:20), providing a weak echo of the covenant in LXX Gen 17:12-13 where God commands that both the slave bought with money (from any foreigner "not of your seed") and the slave born to the household (ὁ οἰκογενὴς τῆς οἰκίας σου) are to be circumcised along with sons.

¹³¹ Michael D. Goulder ("John 1,1-2,12 and the Synoptics," in *John and the Synoptics* [ed. A. Denaux; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992], 201-37) argues that "*John was a Pauline Christian embattled with Jewish Christians; and he feels the need to develop the synoptic traditions in the light of this struggle*" (p. 203, emphasis original). The "Jews who believed in him" (John 8:31), in Goulder's reading, represent the sort of Jewish Christians Paul combats in Galatians. Although the argument is not terribly nuanced, and some of his language is misguided and unsavory (e.g. twice referring to Nicodemus as a "greasy" hypocrite, apparently representative of a Jewish Christian type, pp. 202, 226), a Pauline Christian (in Ephesus?) might be expected to be familiar with arguments found in Galatians. Although few others connect John to Paul directly, the similarity of John's argument to Pauline thought in this passage, especially in Galatians and Romans, is widely noted.

¹³² See Martyn, *Galatians*, 304.

There are many connections to this argument in the passage in John: the only time circumcision comes up in the Fourth Gospel is at Tabernacles (John 7:21-23),¹³³ as does “seed,” whether of David (7:42) or of Abraham (8:33, 37).¹³⁴ Here Jesus is “from above” (ἐκ τῶν ἄνω in 8:23, not ἄνωθεν)¹³⁵ in contrast to the present “Jews who believed” in Jerusalem (Jerusalemites? cf. 7:25), who are from below.¹³⁶ Jesus tells them that what determines their association, with the Son or with the slave, is not based on the Law but whether they remain in Jesus’ word, receive Jesus instead of trying to kill him, and continue to believe in him as their “good works” (cp. 6:29). These Jerusalemites will soon fail in belief (cf. 8:45-46).

More importantly for us is how Jesus qualifies discipleship: “you will know the truth” (γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν), and “the truth will free you” (ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς). By way of contrast, failing to keep his word leads to committing sin, making one a slave to sin (δοῦλός ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας, 8:34).¹³⁷ Similarly, Paul tells the Galatians that

¹³³ A parenthetical remark in 7:22 acknowledges that circumcision goes back to the patriarchs, the first allusion to Abraham in the long dispute.

¹³⁴ A comment by Brown (*John*, 1:355) on 8:33 is important to note: “it is not impossible that John, like Paul in Gal iii 16, is playing on the singular word to indicate that Jesus is the real descendant of Abraham.”

¹³⁵ Literally Jesus is “one of those/the things above,” and it is not immediately clear what John means by the above ones/things.

¹³⁶ The identity of the “Jews who have believed” in John 8:31, and whether they should be identified with the many who believed in 8:30, is a notorious crux (see Debbie Hunn, “Who Are ‘They’ in John 8:33?”, *CBQ* 66/3 [2004]: 387-99 for a survey of options). One option is that they are the former disciples who left Jesus (6:60-66), mentioned by the brothers in 7:3, and who may include some of the many who believed Jesus due to his signs—but whom Jesus did not trust—in 2:23-25. See Terry Griffith, “‘The Jews Who Had Believed in Him’ (John 8:31) and the Motif of Apostasy in the Gospel of John,” in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology* (eds. R. Bauckham and C. Mosser; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 183-92.

¹³⁷ A small number of manuscripts beginning with D omit “of sin” here. While the external evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of including the two words and I am not convinced by the position of Sanders and

formerly they did not know God (οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν)¹³⁸ so that they were enslaved (ἐδουλεύσατε) to lesser beings (Gal 4:8). Elsewhere he draws a contrast between the former lives of believers as slaves of sin (δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας) and their present lives as slaves of righteousness who have been given eternal life (Rom 6:15-23). In either case, their former slavery is not something they should return to since “*Christ freed us*” (ἡμᾶς χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν, Gal 5:1).¹³⁹

John wants to contrast lives without Christ and the liberation that comes with Christ, and it draws heavily on traditional material to do so.¹⁴⁰ Like Paul, John contrasts being Abraham’s biological offspring (σπέρμα, 8:33, 37) with being his children (τέκνα, 8:39) who do his works.¹⁴¹ Jesus has already established that at least some of his present audience knows neither him nor his Father (7:28; 8:19; cp. 8:14). Nor will they know

Martin, who argue that “of sin” is a gloss inserted by a copyist in imitation of Rom 6:17, 20 (*John*, 228). If they are correct, this would indicate how close John’s language is to Paul’s here.

¹³⁸ John and Paul use different verbs for knowing, and it is likely that John is not directly dependent on Galatians as a text, but on the line of thinking contained in Galatians. However, it should be pointed out that John presents a future possibility, for which it always uses γινώσκω (cf. John 7:17; 8:28; 13:35; 14:20). John uses the two verbs interchangeably for the most part in any event. For knowing Christ elsewhere in Pauline literature, see 2 Cor. 2:14; 5:16; Eph 4:13. For knowing God, see 2 Cor. 10:5; Eph 1:17.

¹³⁹ In fact the verb ἐλευθερώω appears in the NT only in John, Galatians, and Romans. Paul makes passive statements in Rom 6:18, 22 (“freed from sin”) but in 8:2 the agent is the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The Jews in John paraphrase with the noun, ἐλεύθεροι (8:33). Paul uses this word to describe one of his attributes as an apostle (1 Cor 9:1, “Am I not a free person?”), in the baptismal claim that in Christ Jews or Greeks, slaves or free people drink of the same Spirit (1 Cor 12:13; cf. Eph 6:8 and also John 7:37-39; 8:31) so that there are no longer slaves or free people (Gal 3:28) because in the renewal Christ is in all (Col 3:11; cf. John 8:37).

¹⁴⁰ Compare John 15:14-15 with another condition of discipleship that employs “slave” language: “You are my friends *if you do what I command you*. I no longer call you slaves, because *the slave does not know* what his master is doing. I have called you friends because *I have made known to you* all the things I heard from my Father.”

¹⁴¹ See Steven A. Hunt, “And the Word Became Flesh—Again? Jesus and Abraham in John 8:31-59,” in *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham: Essays in Honor of Marvin R. Wilson* (ed. S.A. Hunt; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 81-109, here 93-94.

whether his teaching is from God unless they do the will of God (7:17), which is that everyone who sees and *believes in* the Son of Man has eternal life (6:40; cp. 8:28). John draws in this broad complex of themes as well as the trial motif by re-phrasing traditional language in terms of knowing the truth and *the truth* liberating disciples. The “Jews who believed,” but who value their hereditary descent from Abraham, strip Jesus’ saying of its threefold reference to truth, exasperated that Jesus suggests they are not already, like Sarah and Isaac, free. They deny that anything could make them free by eliminating the agent of their liberation, while Jesus, in his paraphrase, makes his claim even more specific: the *Son* will free them, and only then will they really be free people (8:36).¹⁴²

A Prophet Does not Have Honor in His Own Fatherland (John 4:44)

Some of the same problems with John 1:34 apply to the narrator’s citation in 4:44, where a traditional line of Jesus seems to be inserted, some might say awkwardly so:¹⁴³

John 4:44: For Jesus himself testified, “A prophet does not have honor in his own homeland.”

In the context, Jesus is leaving Judea through Samaria and heading toward Galilee. It is not entirely clear whether the aorist tense of “testified” (ἐμαρτύρησεν) suggests that Jesus said this as he was leaving Samaria (so matches the verbs regarding his present trip, ἐξῆλθεν [4:43], ἦλθεν, ἐδέξαντο [4:45]), or that he said it on some previous occasion (so

¹⁴² Edwyn C. Hoskyns (*The Fourth Gospel* [London: Faber & Faber, 1967], 337) notes a connection to an episode in Matt 17:24-27 that ends with the line, “the sons are free people,” spoken in response to a parabolic question about the temple tax, whether kings receive tribute from sons or others. There is at least a connection through the temple, but not much else.

¹⁴³ E.g. Lindars, *John*, 200 (“a proverbial saying of Jesus which does not seem to fit”).

matches verbs regarding actions prior to his trip, ἐποίησεν, ἦλθον [4:45]).¹⁴⁴ Since the latter is possible, let us take a moment to explore what might be going on.

Similar expressions appear in Mark 6:4; Matt 13:54; Luke 4:24; and *Gos. Thom.* 31.¹⁴⁵ In each of the Synoptic cases, the saying is tied to Jesus' rejection in Nazareth and the homeland is Galilee. In John, it is not clear what is going on.¹⁴⁶ The stress could be on his leaving Judea: "he left *from there*... for Jesus himself said, 'A prophet...'" At least since Origen (*Comm. Io.* 13.55) such a reading has been recognized to imply that Judea is his home rather than Galilee.¹⁴⁷ This contradicts the Synoptic use of the saying as well as associations between Jesus and Galilee in the Fourth Gospel (cf. 1:45-46; 7:3, 41, 52; 18:5, 7; 19:19).¹⁴⁸ Others read it as a proleptic warning about the welcome of the Galileans, emphasizing the destination: "he left from there *into Galilee*, for Jesus himself

¹⁴⁴ The latter option is suggested by Fortna ("Use of Locale," 73) when he argues that 4:44 recalls 4:1-3, which explains why Jesus left Judea.

¹⁴⁵ The Thomasine version survives in Greek (*P. Oxy.* 1) and Coptic. The insertion of the saying here is actually more like the presentation of sayings in Gnostic documents—nearly free of narrative context with nonexplicit connections to the surrounding material—than it is to John's other sayings material.

¹⁴⁶ J. Willemse ("La patrie de Jesus selon Saint Jean IV.44," *NTS* 11/4 [1965]: 349-64) traces variations on four solutions in the literature: the *patris* is 1) Palestine generally, 2) Galilee/Nazareth and 4:44 is either a (too brief) summary of the rejection at Nazareth story; or Jesus went to Galilee to rest because no one would care about him there; or the kind reception of the Galileans (4:45) is not true honor, like the belief of the Jerusalemites was not true belief (cf. 2:23-25), 3) Judea/Jerusalem (Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 284 as an intentional modification of the Synoptic accounts), or 4) indeterminable because 4:44 is either an insertion by an overeager and not terribly thoughtful scribe (or by a later author, von Wahlde, *John*, 202-3), or a marginal note that worked its way into the body of the text (so Jürgen Becker, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* [OTNT 4/1; 2 vols.; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verl.-Haus Mohn, 1991], 2:222). The variety of proposed solutions should warn against an overly definite analysis.

¹⁴⁷ See 3) in the previous note and Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, 260; Sanders and Mastin, *John*, 154. Notice also that Jesus speaks about people who *fail to honor the Son* in the next chapter in Jerusalem (5:23).

¹⁴⁸ Keener points out that most of these are assertions made about Jesus by others (*John*, 1:629) although Jesus does confirm that he is "the Nazorean" (not "of Nazareth") in John 18.

said...¹⁴⁹ In this case the transitional passage acts much like John 2:23-25 (to which it alludes anyway),¹⁵⁰ warning against trusting ephemeral demonstrations of belief based on signs.¹⁵¹

If the statement points to Judea, then the Fourth Gospel uses the oddly timed quotation to counter the Synoptic picture and re-center Jesus' home in Jerusalem. If the transitional passage is meant as a companion piece to the warning about signs belief in 2:23-25 and the Galileans are in view, then it would seem to highlight Jesus' foreknowledge, a feature particularly emphasized in the Fourth Gospel.¹⁵² Whichever is the case, John presents it as testimony of Jesus in support of the gospel's lawsuit motif.

You Have a Demon (John 7:20; 8:48)

Defenses against accusations of demon possession can be traced to Markan (3:22, 30) and non-Markan (Matt 10:25; 12:24; Luke 11:15-19) Synoptic traditions. The original statement of the crowd in John is only, "You have a demon" (7:20). In form if not in person, this is quite close to Mark's, "He has Beelzebul" (3:22), quoted as, "He has

¹⁴⁹ Dunderberg, "Anomalies," 115-16; Köstenberger, *John*, 168.

¹⁵⁰ In 2:23-25 it is noted that many believed in Jesus because they saw the signs he did (θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει), but that Jesus did not trust their belief. In 4:45 it is noted that the Galileans welcomed Jesus because they saw everything he did in Jerusalem (πάντα ἑωρακότες ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις).

¹⁵¹ Dunderberg, "Anomalies," 121; Zbyněk Garský, *Das Wirken Jesu in Galiläa bei Johannes* (WUNT 2.325; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 156-58 argues that the mistrust signaled by this passage comes to fruition in John 6, where Jesus is rejected in Capernaum. John 6:41-42, which has the Jews ask whether Jesus is not the son of Joseph, a question similar to one found in the Synoptic rejection scenes (cf. Mark 6:3 and pars.), would then signal a reader familiar with the Synoptics that Jesus' warning is coming to fruition.

¹⁵² See esp. von Wahlde, *John*, 1:163-64. Like other *narrative* assertions of Jesus' special knowledge, this would be negative and point to his rejection (as in 2:23-25, but see also 6:65, 71; 13:1-3, 11; 18:4; 19:28).

an unclean spirit” (3:30).¹⁵³ When John’s statement is quoted, the accusation that he is a Samaritan is added, an accusation unique to the Fourth Gospel. John is also the only gospel to portray Jesus as not only active in Samaria, but also quite successful there during his ministry.¹⁵⁴ The original accusation incorporates traditional language and motifs, while the quotation develops the statement in a manner unique to John and in a way that fits the particular argument in John 8 where questions of heritage are paramount.

I Am Coming to You (John 14:3, 18, 28)

Our last quoted phrase will serve as an appropriate bridge to verses connected in some way to Mark 9:1, since it too seems to have something to do with Jesus’ return, although in what capacity varies. Twice in the first farewell discourse Jesus tells the disciples that he is coming “again” (14:3) or “to you” (14:18). The second statement is quoted verbatim in 14:28 (ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς). The verb, ἔρχομαι, is applied to Christ’s advent throughout early Christian literature, including in John.¹⁵⁵ Elsewhere it is not always clear which “coming” is meant (into the world, resurrection, or the “second coming”), but often enough an eschatological context is in view in both the Pauline literature¹⁵⁶ and in the Synoptic tradition.¹⁵⁷ Furthermore, direct statements similar to the one

¹⁵³ It is even closer to claims made about the Baptist (quoted by Jesus), that “he has a demon” (Matt 11:18 // Luke 7:33).

¹⁵⁴ On this point, see Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, “Gesù, le città e i villaggi. Le città guardate dalla periferia,” *ASE* 27/1 (2010): 233-54, here 242 n. 42.

¹⁵⁵ The references are too numerous to list, but see Arens, *HAΘON-Sayings*.

¹⁵⁶ The Pauline literature more often uses *παρουσία* to refer to the appearance of Christ at the eschaton, but see 2 Thess. 1:10: “when he comes (ὅταν ἔλθῃ) on that day [cp. John 14:20] to be glorified by his holy ones and to be marveled at by all those who believed.” The phrase, “when he comes,” also appears in the Syn-

made three times in John 14 appear elsewhere and seem to point to a future, eschatological application. Luke features two parables in which a potential Christ figure says, “I am coming” (the parable of the barren fig tree, Luke 13:7; the parable of the pounds, Luke 19:13).¹⁵⁸ These can be read with Christ as the owner of the vineyard or the nobleman respectively, coming in judgment at the end.

More suggestive are the seven uses of the first-person, “I am coming,” in Revelation. The first three are spoken in quick succession to the angels of the churches:

Rev 2:5: “Repent and do the works of before! Otherwise I am coming to you (ἔρχομαί σοι) and I will remove your lampstand from its place, unless you repent.”

Rev 2:16: “Therefore repent! Otherwise I am coming to you quickly (ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ) and I will make war against them with the sword of my mouth.”

Rev 3:11: “I am coming quickly (ἔρχομαι ταχύ). Hold fast to what you have so that no one may take the crown from you.”

The first two encourage repentance because Christ is coming soon, while the third encourages perseverance for the same reason. In the visionary section Christ declares that

optic tradition applied to the Son of Man in his glory (Mark 8:38; Matt 25:31; Luke 9:26), and in parables with messianic and eschatological undertones (see Matt 21:40; Luke 14:10).

¹⁵⁷ In addition to the references in the previous note, see Mark’s “little apocalypse” (cf. 13:35-36, “you do not know when the master [κύριος] of the house comes [ἔρχεται]... unless, coming [ἐλθὼν] suddenly, he finds you sleeping”); this passage is expanded and supplemented in Matt 24:42-44 (ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται... ἔρχεται... ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται). Cp. Luke 18:8 and Luke 12:37; *Did.* 16:1; as well as the apparent scribal insertion in Matt 25:13: “So watch, because you do not know the day or the hour [on which the Son of Man comes]” (beginning with C³).

¹⁵⁸ The first parable is unique to Luke; the second is shared with Matt 25:14-30, which does not have Luke’s “until I come,” but has later in the parable, “After much time, the master (κύριος) of those slaves comes (ἔρχεται) and takes account with them.”

he is coming like a thief (Rev 16:15; cp. 1 Thess. 5:2), and as the visions close we hear another threefold repetition by the glorified Christ:¹⁵⁹

Rev 22:7: “Behold I am coming (ἔρχομαι) quickly! Blessed is the one who keeps the words of this book’s prophecy!”

Rev 22:12: “Behold I am coming (ἔρχομαι) quickly! And my reward is with me, to give to each according to his work.”

Rev 22:20: The one who testifies to these things says, “Yes, I am coming (ἔρχομαι) quickly!” Amen, come (ἔρχου) Lord Jesus!

So in Revelation, which some date earlier than the final form of John,¹⁶⁰ there is a seven-fold repetition of Christ declaration, “I am coming (to you),” each time in the context of some sort of future eschatological event. Even in the Gospel of John, Jesus saying that the Beloved Disciple could remain “until I come” (ἕως ἔρχομαι) gives rise to the notion that the Disciple will never die (21:22-23)!

John does not modify the statement when it is quoted, although it is extracted from its previous contexts. We will examine sayings about Jesus’ returns in chapter 5, but it is enough to say here that in 14:2-3 where Jesus first says, “I am coming again,” the saying is embedded in deeply apocalyptic language that is elsewhere applied to the future eschaton. When it reappears in 14:18, it is still surrounded by apocalyptic language,

¹⁵⁹ Given the presence of other numerical structures in Revelation, it would not seem to be coincidental that this important declaration not only appears seven times, but that it is structured in a 3-1-3 distribution at the opening of the apocalypse, during its central visions, and at its close.

¹⁶⁰ By no means a consensus position, but see e.g. J. Christian Wilson, “The Problem of the Domitianic Date of Revelation,” *NTS* 39/4 (2009): 587-605; Mark Wilson, “The Early Christians in Ephesus and the Date of Revelation, Again,” *Neot* 39/1 (2005): 169-200; and Floyd O. Parker, “‘Our Lord and God’ in Rev 4,11: Evidence for the Late Date of Revelation?”, *Biblica* 82/2 (2001): 207-31. Lupieri (*Apocalypse*, 44) gives a more cautious dating of 70 to 100 CE, much of that range prior to John. Even if we date Revelation with Irenaeus (*Ag. Her.* 5.30.3) to the end of Domitian’s reign, it does not seem to draw on John 14:18, 28 but rather they are both drawing on traditional, eschatological language (esp. LXX Mal. 3:1). An early date for Revelation would simply provide a more concrete precedent for such language.

although now language that is more ambiguous in context and which could easily apply to the resurrection. When Jesus finally quotes himself (14:28), it appears much more likely that Jesus refers to his presence in the community through the Paraclete, an advent particularly emphasized in the Fourth Gospel.

Unless Someone Is Born from Above, He Cannot See the Kingdom of God (John 3:3, 7)

We can now take on the last batch of sayings, each of which has been linked in some way to the motifs found in Mark 9:1. The first saying that Theobald takes on appears as a non-sequitur addressed to Nicodemus during his first meeting with Jesus (John 3:3).¹⁶¹ Theobald gives five points in favor of the logion being traditional to John: 1) it is marked by the double amen, which is often used to incorporate traditional material; 2) the saying is self-sufficient; 3) it incorporates language uncharacteristic of the Fourth Gospel (“Kingdom of God”) that is evident elsewhere in the tradition; 4) the content of the saying has parallels elsewhere in the tradition (Matt 18:3; Mark 10:15 // Luke 18:17; Justin, *Apol.* 1.61.4); and 5) the quotation in 3:7 marks it as already citable.¹⁶² Here I will address the third and fourth points.¹⁶³

¹⁶¹ Theobald takes on 3:3 and 3:5 as a pair in search of the original speech form, but that is not our concern here. The introduction of Nicodemus is occasionally connected to the Synoptic story of the rich young man (e.g. Lindars, *John*, 147) for several reasons: John and Luke call each a “ruler,” the young man addresses Jesus as “teacher,” and the story ends with another saying about entering the Kingdom (cf. Mark 10:25; Matt 19:24; Luke 18:25). If there is a connection, then one of the few Synoptic references to “eternal life” is presumably held off until John 3:15-16 (cp. Matt 19:16, “...that I might have eternal life”). My concern is with the saying in John 3:3 specifically, not with conjectures about the entire scene’s construction that become more difficult to prove as they grow more complex.

¹⁶² Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 62-63.

Theobald and Culpepper argue that 3:3 (and 5) provides a key-text on which the discourse is built, which suggests that it is traditional and “Kingdom of God” a relic of earlier tradition.¹⁶⁴ Theobald sees reflections of two Synoptic logia:¹⁶⁵

Matt 18:3: “Amen I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.”¹⁶⁶

Mark 10:15/Luke 18:17: “Amen I say to you, whoever would not receive the Kingdom of God like a child, he will never enter into it.”¹⁶⁷

Since there is some dispute about its relative independence from the Synoptic tradition, we might also add:

Gos. Thom. 46: “But I have said, ‘Whoever among you becomes a child will know the Kingdom, and will become more exalted than John’.”¹⁶⁸

¹⁶³ The first point is sound although inconclusive on its own (see above, chapter 1 n. 82). The last is in part the hypothesis being explored here, so must be supported on other grounds.

¹⁶⁴ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 93-97; and Culpepper, “Origin,” 256: “John 3:3 is therefore a classic example of how [the Fourth Evangelist] can take a traditional logion and build a discourse around it.” See also Lincoln, *John*, 149; Brown, *John*, 1:130; Köstenberger (*John*, 122), for example, claims the phrase “underscores the authenticity of the present passage,” tracing its general absence in John to the lack of narrative parables. By contrast, von Wahlde (*John*, 2:124-30), argues that “Kingdom of God” was added later but is still a traditional element meant to align John with the Synoptic tradition.

¹⁶⁵ See also Dodd, *Tradition*, 358-59 for a similar position on John’s independent development of the Synoptic saying, as well as the literature cited by John W. Pryor (“John 3.3, 5. A Study in the Relationship of John’s Gospel to the Synoptic Tradition,” *JSNT* 41 [1991]: 71-95, p. 72 n. 4). Lincoln (*John*, 36) argues instead that John reformulates Matthew and Luke directly.

¹⁶⁶ If John has adapted Matthew’s logion, then John and Matthew share the εἰς μὴ + οὐ construction, although John says “he *cannot*” and Matthew “you *will not*” (οὐ μὴ + subj.); Matthew has “enter into” (εἰσελθῆτε εἰς) the Kingdom, although “of Heaven” as is characteristic of the First Gospel; and although Matthew uses γίνομαι where John uses γεννάω, the verbs have some phonetic similarities. Pryor (“John 3.3, 5,” 77) points also to Matt 5:20 for a similar structure and a threat of never entering the Kingdom.

¹⁶⁷ Mark’s ὅς ἂν μὴ + οὐ construction is still fairly close to John’s, although not so much as Matthew’s. Lindars (“John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Test Case,” *NTS* 29 [1981]: 287-94, here 288) argues that Matt 18:3 is an “independent version of the same saying” as Mark 10:15. Dodd (*Tradition*, 359) argues that if John were directly dependent on the Synoptics, he would have to take the general form from Matthew 18:3 but “Kingdom of God” from Mark and/or Luke.

¹⁶⁸ Translation adapted from Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures*, 388 under the influence of Thomas O. Lambdin (“The Gospel of Thomas (II, 2),” in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* [ed. J.M. Robinson; Leiden:

Although seemingly an adaptation of a different Synoptic saying (Matt 11:11 // Luke 7:28, “The least in the Kingdom... is greater than [John]”), *Thomas* alters it so that, instead of one who *is* least and *in* the Kingdom, one *becomes* a child as a pre-condition to experiencing the Kingdom. Notice that material that certainly pre-dates the Coptic *Thomas* is marked as an unverifiable quotation by the character Jesus (see above, n. 20).

The similarities between the Synoptic sayings and John 3:3, 5 are both structural and thematic. Thematically, each speaks of a spiritual rejuvenation as a necessary criterion for experience of the Kingdom. Two possibilities are likely: either John significantly modified (a) Synoptic saying(s),¹⁶⁹ or it incorporated sayings with roots early enough to develop independently into the Synoptic and Johannine forms.¹⁷⁰ If the latter, the point is made. If the former and John borrows from Matthew, Mark, or Luke, then it retains from the original the amen-introduction, the hypothetical conditional structure, and some reference to the Kingdom. Meanwhile John introduces new terminology when it heightens the idea of “becoming like children” to being born anew, from above. When the statement is quoted, each of the elements supposedly retained from the Synoptic pre-texts is dropped: *only being born from above is kept in quotation*.

Brill, 1978], 123) and at the suggestion of John Dominic Crossan (*In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus* [Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1983], 325-26), who notes that the Coptic word *kwi* can be translated either as “child” (and so relevant to our discussion) or “little one” (and so more relevant to the Synoptic saying about the Baptist). Although rarely presented as a direct quotation in English translation, the Coptic construction is consistent with other direct speech acts in *Thomas*. Even more loosely connected, if we hear an echo of rebirth, is *Gos. Thom.* 114, “Every female that makes herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven.” However the saying is more or less free-standing as the final logion, and if there is any link to John 3:3, 5, it is only after a long process of development.

¹⁶⁹ So Lincoln, *John*, 149-50; Sanders and Mastin, *John*, 123-24.

¹⁷⁰ Barrett, *John*, 206.

It is not to say that spiritual rebirth is absent elsewhere in the tradition, only that John's phrasing of birth *from above* is unattested in the tradition prior to the Fourth Gospel.¹⁷¹ First Peter 1:3, 23 speak of being *born anew* (ἀναγεννάω) into living hope, either through Christ's resurrection or the living and abiding word of God.¹⁷² Titus 3:5 claims that God "saved us through the washing of *regeneration* (παλιγγενεσίας) and renewal by the Holy Spirit."¹⁷³ When Justin explains baptism he uses similar terminology, almost excessively:

Ap. 1.61: Then they are brought by us where there is water, and in a manner of regeneration (ἀναγεννήσεως) by which we ourselves were also regenerated (ἀνεγεννήθημεν), they are regenerated (ἀναγεννῶνται). For in the name of God, the Father and Master of the Entirety, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then perform a washing in water. For Christ also said, "Unless you are regenerated, you will never enter the Kingdom of Heaven" (ἄν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν). And it is manifest to all that it is impossible for those who have been born once to enter (ἐμβῆναι) into the bodies of mothers.

¹⁷¹ Being born or begotten of the Spirit does appear elsewhere: in Matthew Mary is found to be pregnant "by (or from) the Holy Spirit" (ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, 1:18) and an angel tells Joseph that Mary's child "was conceived by the Holy Spirit" (γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, 1:20). Troy Martin's examination of Matthew's use of ἐκ, uncharacteristic of the First Gospel if indicating agency but in line with the Spirit (or the wind) as initiating principle, is particularly apt with regard to John since soon after mentioning being "born from πνεύματος" it follows with a saying playing off of the double meaning of spirit/wind (John 3:8; see "Animals Impregnated by the Wind and Mary's Pregnancy by the Holy Spirit," *ASE* 31/2 [2014]: 11-24, esp. 18-22). In Galatians 4:28-31, Isaac is "born according to the Spirit" (γεννηθεὶς κατὰ πνεῦμα) and by analogy so are believers.

¹⁷² If the authors of John were aware of this tradition, one might easily understand its appeal.

¹⁷³ Παλιγγενεσία also appears in Matt 19:28, although it seems to point to a collective renewal, perhaps tied to the eschatological resurrection, rather than a personal one (Keener, *Matthew*, 480). Titus uses an odd spelling for παλιγγενεσία with the ν intact.

Although Beasley-Murray, for example, sees here an independent attestation of the tradition in John 3:3-4,¹⁷⁴ and Theobald allows it as a remote possibility, the latter rightly spots the influence—direct or indirect—of John on Justin.¹⁷⁵ What the passage more likely demonstrates is the early association of the sayings in John with baptism and their conflation with Matt 18:3.¹⁷⁶

As Theobald argues, there was probably a tradition regarding *παλιγγενεσία* or more likely *ἀναγέννησις* already available to John.¹⁷⁷ The Johannine tradition apparently had a tendency to formulate descriptions of entry into the community in terms of birth, especially *of God*,¹⁷⁸ but also of water and of Spirit (3:5, 6, 8), so that they can be in some sense God's children like Jesus (see esp. 1 John 5:18) who is "from above" (John 3:31; also 8:23).¹⁷⁹ The Johannine innovation is to take the *ἀναγεννάω* from the tradition and

¹⁷⁴ G.R. Beasley-Murray, "John 3.3, 5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom," *ExpT* 97/6 (1986): 167-70. For other scholars who argue that Justin is independent of John, see James W. Barker, "Written Gospel or Oral Tradition? Patristic Parallels to John 3:3, 5," *EC* 6 (2015): 543-58, esp. 548 nn. 15-16. Barker helpfully tabulates early patristic parallels to John 3:3, 5 and examines arguments for their independence from John, ultimately concluding that all of them, including Justin, show signs of Johannine influence.

¹⁷⁵ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 80-86. However, the influence is not necessarily shown in the citation of Jesus' words, the phrasing of which may derive from baptismal usage pre-dating Justin, but in his (loose) recollection of Nicodemus' objection. See also Pryor, "John 3.3, 5," 75-76.

¹⁷⁶ In addition to Justin, see Clem. Alex., *Prot.* 9.82.4; Ps.-Clem., *Hom.* 11.26.2; *Recog.* 1.69.5; 6.9.2; Hippolytus, *Ref.* 8.10.8; and *Apost. Const.* 6.15.5 for similar conflations.

¹⁷⁷ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 66.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. John 1:13; 1 John 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18 (2x).

¹⁷⁹ Sandnes draws particular attention to the role of the principle, "like is known by like" in this passage ("Whence and Whither"). William C. Grese ("‘Unless One Is Born Again’: The Use of the Heavenly Journey in John 3," *JBL* 107/4 [1988]: 677-93), building on the influential article by Wayne A. Meeks ("The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *JBL* 91/1 [1972]: 44-72), connects the seeing and entering of God's Kingdom to heavenly journeys, of which the Son of Man is the sole performer (John 3:13). Only by being begotten from above as Jesus was, and through his mediation can the believer hope to understand heavenly things and to attain eternal life.

reformulate it in terms of γεννάω ἄνωθεν, which has two advantages: first, it allows a direct connection between the believer and Christ. As Jesus is the Son of God who comes from above, so also the believer is a child of God who is (re-)born from above. Second, in its more immediate literary context, the new phrase allows the double-entendre of “from above” and “again,” something neither ἀνα- nor παλιν- would allow.¹⁸⁰ John is notably fond of polyvalency, especially when it creates a misunderstanding that can be clarified by Jesus. Nicodemus believes it would be *impossible* for him to be born a second time. Jesus, in his paraphrastic self-quotation, explains that it is *necessary* (3:7).

As has been mentioned, however, John 3:3 is occasionally connected to Mark 9:1 and pars., another amen-saying that speaks of seeing the Kingdom of God:¹⁸¹

Mark 9:1: “*Amen I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death until they see the Kingdom of God having come in power.*”

This Markan tradition has also been connected to John 8:51-52 and 21:22-23, making it quite possible that in composing a double variant of the saying regarding spiritual rebirth, John adapted *seeing* the Kingdom from an eschatological tradition and *entering* the Kingdom from a baptismal one.¹⁸² If so, John may be criticizing those who put their hope for a

¹⁸⁰ Is this a critique of non-Johannine Christian traditions of “rebirth,” or a theological clarification and/or expansion of them?

¹⁸¹ Köstenberger, *John*, 122. Caragounis (“Kingdom of God,” 125) connects the verse to Mark 9:1 as well as Mark (*sic*, Luke) 13:28, “when you see Abraham... in the Kingdom of God.” The Synoptics use the same verb (ἰδεῖν) as John. Luke’s version (9:27) is the closest since “they” see only the Kingdom of God, rather than, in Mark, the Kingdom of God *coming in power*. Matthew replaces the object so that they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom (16:28).

¹⁸² Cp. Carson, *John*, 188: “To a Jew with the background and convictions of Nicodemus, ‘to see the kingdom of God’ was to participate in the kingdom at the end of the age, to experience eternal, resurrection life. The same equivalence is found in the Synoptics (cf. Mk. 9:43, 45 ‘to enter life’, parallel to 9:47 ‘to enter the kingdom of God’).”

vision of God's Kingdom only in end-times apocalypticism rather than in the current, spiritual vision of Christ already available to those who believe in him (cp. embedded in DIQ, John 14:8-9, "Whoever has seen me has seen the Father").¹⁸³

If Anyone Keeps My Word, He Will Never See Death Forever (John 8:51-52)

Toward the end of John 8, Jesus' now hostile audience interprets him to say that a person who keeps his word will never physically die. Jesus says someone who keeps his word will never see death (8:51), and the Jews quote him as saying such a person will never taste of it (8:52). There are two traditions connected to this saying, one more firmly prior to John than the other. The possibly later tradition appears in the *Gospel of Thomas*:

Gos. Thom. Prologue (*P. Oxy.* 654): These are the hidden words of the living one that Jesus said and that Judas, who is called Thomas, has written down. And he said, "Whoever finds the interpretation of these words will never taste death ([θανάτου] οὐ μὴ γεύσεται)." ¹⁸⁴

The prologue marks the words of the gospel as past speech acts, even if it is unclear whether Jesus said the first logion or Thomas did.¹⁸⁵ That the phrasing in *Thomas* resonates so precisely with John's can mean either that *Thomas* records an independent version of the tradition in John 8:51-52,¹⁸⁶ in which case the tradition would pre-date

¹⁸³ Cp. Barrett, *John*, 207: "'Kingdom of God' calls to mind that apocalyptic Judaism which John seems for the most part to avoid... [3:3] is criticism of that Judaism which was content to await the miraculous vindication of Israel in the kingdom of God and to ignore the necessity for inward conversion or rebirth." Although Barrett might not agree, some of the Judaisms that John is critical of here may also be of the Christ-following sort.

¹⁸⁴ For other references to not tasting death, see *Gos. Thom.* 18-19; 85.

¹⁸⁵ Although most of the logia are introduced by, "Jesus said," that Jesus also gave this saying is allowed by the logia introduced by only, "And he said" (*Gos. Thom.* 8; 21; 51-53; 65; 72; 74; 79; 91; 99).

¹⁸⁶ Nicholas Perrin and Christopher W. Skinner ("Recent Trends in *Gospel of Thomas* Research (1989-2011). Part II: Genre, Theology, and Relationship to the Gospel of John," *CBR* 11/1 [2012]: 65-86, here 78-

John, or that *Thomas* is influenced by John,¹⁸⁷ in which case we cannot be sure. *P. Oxy.* 654 dates within a few decades of the earliest manuscripts containing John 8:51-52. However, I am still hesitant to consider *Thomas* as strong evidence for a pre-Johannine tradition in these verses. It seems more likely that *Thomas* has taken John's logion, which speaks of merely keeping Jesus' word, and amplified it as the opening of a Gnostic or proto-Gnostic sayings text to claim that one must not only keep the words but also *interpret* them correctly.

The earlier case appears in Mark 9:1 ("there are some standing here who will not taste death...") and is adapted by both Matthew and Luke. Precisely what "some" will see varies in Matthew and Luke, but otherwise the saying is fairly stable.¹⁸⁸ Much of what is going on in Mark has been subject to scrutiny: who will see the Kingdom coming with power, friends or foes?¹⁸⁹ Is it an early reference to the *parousia*, as it seems, one perhaps not yet contradicted by the eventual death of everyone imagined to be standing

81) track scholars who advocate for shared sources, a shared community, or that John was dependent on, or at least familiar with, some form of *Thomas*.

¹⁸⁷ An under-explored option with weak counter-arguments (e.g. that *Thomas* never cites John directly) that may be avoided in the interest of maintaining the perceived "primitivity" of the material in *Thomas*. See Perrin and Skinner, "Recent Trends," 81 for the minority of scholars who view *Thomas* as reacting to John.

¹⁸⁸ Luke 9:27 substitutes ἀληθῶς for ἀμὴν, αὐτοῦ for ὧδε, and οἱ for οἵτινες. Matthew 16:28 alters the principle from ἐστηκότων to ἐστῶτων.

¹⁸⁹ By "friends" could be meant either the disciples or the members of Mark's community (see the literature cited by Thomas R. Hatina, "Who Will See 'The Kingdom of God Coming with Power' in Mark 9,1—Protagonists or Antagonists?," *Biblica* 86/1 [2005]: 20-34, here 20 nn. 1-2). Hatina instead takes the position that the Kingdom will be seen by "this sinful and adulterous generation" (Mark 8:38).

by Jesus in the 30s, or does Mark discursively attempt to reapply eschatological language to something else like the crucifixion or, more likely, the transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8)?¹⁹⁰

The eschatological problem may be felt by John, whether with the saying itself or with its use in Mark. The context of John 8:51-52 deals with precisely this issue: do Jesus' predictions about eternal life indicate that believers will never physically die? It is a problem dealt with elsewhere by Paul,¹⁹¹ and, as we will see, by the followers of the Beloved Disciple (John 21:22-23). It is notable that the quotation by the Jews is closer to the Synoptic tradition than Jesus' statement. For this reason Lindars, arguing that John is dependent on a tradition close to Mark (if not Mark itself), connects the *quotation* to tradition rather than the statement that is directly attributed to Jesus.¹⁹² Still marked as an amen-saying in 8:51, John also eliminates the temporal reference by changing the condition:¹⁹³ not experiencing death is dependent on keeping Jesus' word rather than seeing the Kingdom.¹⁹⁴ Caragounis traces a similar movement in John 3:3, where "seeing" is

¹⁹⁰ Enrique Nardoni ("A Redactional Interpretation of Mark 9:1," *CBQ* 43/3 [1981]: 365-84) argues convincingly that Mark takes a saying about the *parousia* from the tradition and re-applies it to the transfiguration. If Mark does reapply the saying to the transfiguration, the eschatological problem is still apparently felt in Luke, which eliminates "having come" and "in power" to make the saying less definite and less time-dependent; so Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 104. For attempts to interpret the prediction as applied to the cross, see Kent Brower, "Mark 9:1: Seeing the Kingdom in Power," *JSNT* 2/6 (1979): 17-41 and Michael F. Bird, "The Crucifixion of Jesus as the Fulfillment of Mark 9:1," *TrinJ* 24/1 (2003): 23-36.

¹⁹¹ See for example 1 Thess. 4:13-5:11 (esp. 4:15) and 1 Corinthians 15 (esp. 15:36, 51).

¹⁹² Lindars, *John*, 332-33.

¹⁹³ Lincoln, *John*, 275.

¹⁹⁴ The only Synoptic use of seeing death occurs in Luke 2:26 where the conditional is time dependent: Simeon is told by the Holy Spirit that he will not see death (μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον) before he sees (ἴδῃ) the Lord's Messiah. Given the eschatological issues in John's saying, we might also consider Rev 6:8: "And I saw (εἶδον), and behold (ἰδοὺ) a green horse, and he who was sitting on it, his name was Death."

not conditioned by a temporal factor, the *when* of the [Kingdom of God], but by the basic prerequisites for catching a glimpse of it, that is, the *conditions* for seeing the Kingdom at all.”¹⁹⁵ Only true disciples (cp. 8:31-32) will not see death. Only those born from above, of water and of the Spirit, will see the Kingdom of God (3:3). Neither of these realities, whatever is meant by them, will be experienced by Jesus’ enemies.

The logion, as it is phrased in Mark, is likely evidence that some early Christians, if not Jesus himself, expected a realization of future eschatological hopes in the lifetime of some of those who knew Jesus. According to such a belief, some of these people would never physically die; *they* would have life into the *aiōn*. John presents this as a profound misunderstanding by voicing it through hostile (if formerly believing) Jews. They interpret Jesus to mean that those who keep his word will never physically die, when even Abraham and the prophets died (8:52-53). Placing the logion with more traditional phrasing in the mouths of Jesus’ enemies, during one of the most hostile scenes in the gospel, distances Jesus from temporal claims about the end and criticizes any believers in Christ who would make it. The fit here, however, between John and Mark is not exact: John’s Jesus makes a statement about anyone (τις) who keeps his word, while Mark’s Jesus includes only some (τινες) of those standing by him as if to say that the advent will be within the lifespan of only *certain* people. John provides a response to such a specific claim in the final case of DIQ in the gospel.

¹⁹⁵ Caragounis, “Kingdom of God,” 126 (emphasis original).

If I Want Him to Remain until I Come, What Is That to You? (John 21:22-23)

Although there is very little lexical similarity between Mark 9:1 and Jesus' final saying in John, a connection has nonetheless been perceived in the trouble they may have caused.¹⁹⁶ Peter is told about his death and commanded by Jesus to follow him (21:18-19). Peter notices the Beloved Disciple already following them both and asks about him (21:20-21). Jesus responds:

John 21:22: "If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you? You follow me."¹⁹⁷

"Until I come" appears to point to the *parousia*,¹⁹⁸ but the saying is problematic if the Beloved Disciple should die only on the assumption that he actually *will* remain (alive) until such a time. That it could be taken this way is evident, despite John's best efforts, in much later popular traditions that portray the Beloved Disciple as a sort of immortal, wandering the Earth until Jesus' eschatological return.¹⁹⁹ The situation in John's com-

¹⁹⁶ Paul N. Anderson ("John and Mark: The Bi-Optic Gospels," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* [eds. R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001], 175-88, here 184) views John 21:23 as a correction of Mark 9:1: "False rumors had been spread, and perhaps even Peter got it wrong—let alone gospel narratives constructed upon a Petrine memory." Lincoln (*John*, 521), connects both John 8:51-52 and 21:22-23 to Mark 9:1. In the latter case he argues, "In order for the rumour to have had the troubling effect it did, it must have been deeply rooted in the tradition. Its origin could well have been the saying of Jesus in Mark 9.1 that some of his followers would remain alive until the coming of the kingdom in power. Over time this would have become linked to the Beloved Disciple." Both have probably gone too far in pointing to Mark 9:1 as the saying's *origin*: the rhetorical effectiveness of the DIQ relies on using the original wording in the narrator's favor; this would fail if listeners could reply that, actually, he said, "There are some standing here..." Instead, Mark 9:1 gives evidence that the strains of thought necessary to interpret the Johannine saying as the "brothers" do were not unique to the Johannine experience.

¹⁹⁷ The saying shares with Mark 9:1 only ἕως and a form of ἔρχομαι.

¹⁹⁸ It does not seem to refer to Jesus' spiritual return in the body of the church, which presumably has been fulfilled already.

¹⁹⁹ Apparently such legends about John the Beloved were popular in the eastern United States during the 18th and 19th centuries, and were canonized into Mormon mythology along with three Nephites filling similar roles. In the *Book of Mormon*, nine of Christ's American apostles request to go speedily to his King-

munity is quite different: apparently the Beloved Disciple is either dead or close to it, forcing the gospel to address the issue. Here we have no need to hypothesize that John incorporates traditional material or to search for external evidence of it, because the gospel itself marks the saying as a pre-gospel tradition:

John 21:23: So this saying went out among the brothers, “That disciple will not die.” But Jesus did not tell him, “He will not die,”²⁰⁰ but, “If I want him to remain until I come, what is that to you?”

At some point prior to the composition of chapter 21 *something* like this saying went around and as a result gave rise to a misinterpretation presented as an inappropriate paraphrase. The tradition is now too popular to ignore. The narrator quotes the phrase exactly (except for the subtraction of the final command to Peter) specifically to draw attention to its *hypothetical, conditional* form in contrast to a rather more definite paraphrase, “He doesn’t die.” In its final use of the device, the gospel tips its hand to the fact that it can use DIQ to incorporate and to comment upon material that pre-dates its composition, at least in some cases. If each of the last three logia are tied to something

dom after they have lived “unto the age of man” (i.e. 72 years, 3 Nephi 28:2-3). Jesus knows the thoughts of the remaining three and tells them, “ye have desired the thing which *John, my beloved*, who was with me in my ministry, before that I was lifted up by the Jews, desired of me. Therefore, more blessed are ye, for *ye shall never taste of death* [cp. John 8:52!]; but ye shall live to behold all the doings of the Father unto the children of men, even *until... I shall come* in my glory with the powers of heaven” (3 Nephi 28:6-7, emphasis added; cf. also Mormon 1:16; 8:10-11; *Doctrines and Covenants* 7; 78). The three Nephites and John continue to wander separately and occasionally appear to believers individually. In testimonials of such meetings collected by A.E. Fife, one records the appearance of John and four others record the appearance of a man who could either be one of the three Nephites or John (“The Legend of the Three Nephites among the Mormons,” *JAF* 53/207 [1940]: 1-49). A tradition less violent to the text of John appears in some manuscripts of *Acts of John* 115, reflected later in Giotto’s *Assumption of Saint John* (1320) and refuted by Dante (*Paradiso* 25.100-113), posits that John was assumed bodily to heaven before his death. It is not a matter of ignorance of the Fourth Gospel in any case since, in *Acts of John*, when John’s body cannot be found the narrator comments, “we remembered what was spoken by the Lord to Peter.”

²⁰⁰ D presents the second citation of the paraphrase as, “*You* do not die,” (οὐκ ἀποθνήσκεις, which requires just the addition of *ς*) so that the initial paraphrase is an indirect one and Jesus would seem to be speaking directly to the Beloved Disciple. This has little chance of being the original reading.

like what is found in Mark 9:1, it would seem that John was eager to distance Jesus from predictions of an imminent apocalyptic, eschatological advent where Christ is manifested “to the world” instead of only to “those who love me” (cf. John 14:22-23). The Fourth Gospel re-works traditional material to focus on the conditions for seeing the Kingdom of God and for not seeing death rather than their timing, while bluntly dismissing the idea that Jesus predicted anything at all about the Beloved Disciple.

Speculations on Other Possibly Pre-Johannine Material

So far we have examined quoted material with parallels in early Christian texts that either precede John or at least have a fair chance of being independent of the Fourth Gospel. Some of these cases are stronger than others, but a general pattern emerges where John’s use of DIQ overlaps densely with traditional sayings material. We might also speculate about other quoted statements, such as Jesus’ commands in miracle scenes, due to their potential ritual or liturgical resonances and their attachment to primitive material in the gospel. Graham Twelftree, for example, has suggested that by repeating Jesus’ declaration to the royal official, “your son lives,” John “probably intends an echo of the resurrection of Jesus (cf. 14:19).”²⁰¹ Earlier Jesus asks the Samaritan woman to “give me a drink” (4:7), then reinterprets the command not through paraphrase but by pointing out the context:

²⁰¹ “Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics,” in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* (eds. R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 135-43, here 140. In John 14:19, Jesus tells the disciples, “because I live, you also will live.” For other early assertions that Jesus lives (ζῆν), see Rom 6:10; 2 Cor. 13:4; Gal 2:20; *1 Clem.* 58:2; and Mark 16:11, “When they heard that he lives” or, “When they heard, ‘He lives’.” The phrase, “your son lives,” appears in an Elijah healing miracle in LXX 3 Kgdms 17:23. Such a scriptural background would only deepen the resonance of the phrase. Quite speculatively, one can imagine liturgical settings in which calling out, “Your Son lives!” would occur.

John 4:10: “If you knew the gift of God, and who it is who says to you, ‘Give me a drink,’ *you* would have asked *him* and *he* would have given *you* living water.”

An informed audience of the Fourth Gospel knows the gift of God and who Jesus is. John virtually turns to such an audience and gives it the proper response: ask of Jesus, “Give me a drink” so that he may give you living water!²⁰² Finally, Jesus’ command to the blind man, “Go to Siloam (i.e. the *sent one*) and wash,” may sound entirely appropriate as told to a new member about to be baptized.²⁰³ Incorporating these phrases, if traditional, would form a liturgical or ritual connection between the life of Jesus and the believer’s experience. But this is again speculative, whereas the previous examples are preferable because they can be supported by non-Johannine evidence.

²⁰² That is, John seems to instruct its audience how to pray. Martha says that God will *give* Jesus whatever he *asks* (John 11:22), which leads to Jesus’ first prayer of the gospel (11:41-42). Jesus repeats this language throughout the farewell discourse (14:13-15; 15:7, 16; 16:23-26), and the verb δίδωμι appears 11 times in the prayer in John 17. Elsewhere in the NT, δίδωμι often appears in reference to the Spirit (Acts 5:32; 8:18-19; 11:17-18; 15:8; Rom 5:5; 1 Cor 12:8; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; 1 Thess. 4:8; 2 Tim 1:7; 1 John 3:24; 4:13) or in the context of prayer (Acts 4:29 [δός]; and esp. where Jesus teaches his disciples how to pray in Matt 6:11 [δός] // Luke 11:3 [δίδου], “Give us bread”; Eph 1:17, “in my prayers that God... might give you a spirit of wisdom”), sometimes in combination with αἰτέω (esp. Matt 7:7-11 // Luke 11:9-13, “*Ask* and it will be *given* to you... how much more will the Father *give* the Holy Spirit to those who *ask* him”; also James 1:5). Giving and drinking appear together abundantly in the institution of the Eucharist (Mark 14:22-25 // Matt 26:26-29 // Luke 22:17-19); and asking (2x), giving (2x, including δός), *and* drinking (4x) appear together when James and John request to be seated beside Jesus in his glory (Mark 10:35-40; cp. Matt 20:20-23).

²⁰³ Bruce Grigsby (“Washing in the Pool of Siloam: A Thematic Anticipation of the Johannine Cross,” *NovT* 27/3 [1985]: 227-35, here 227) argues that the command serves as “a universal command to all unbelievers to wash in the fountain of cleansing waters at Calvary.” Grigsby demonstrates how that water points to expectations about the temple in the messianic age and to the gift of the Spirit. There is no necessary contradiction in connecting baptism with the gift of the Spirit (or for that matter, with the cross) in the latter half of the first century.

Common Phrases Incorporated through DIQ

Before concluding, a brief note should be said on three common phrases that are imputed to others in John.²⁰⁴ Two appear in chapter 4. First, the Samaritan woman imputes a position to Jesus as a generic Jew:

John 4:20: “Our fathers worshiped on this mountain, yet you say, ‘In Jerusalem is the place where it is necessary to worship’.”

While a close parallel to the Samaritan’s phrasing here has yet to be found, the use of “place” (τόπος) points strongly to Deuteronomy and similar or derivative ideologies:

LXX Deut 12:5: You will seek out whichever place (τόπον) that the Lord your God chose among one of your tribes to establish his name and be called upon there, and you will enter there.

LXX Deut 12:13-14: Watch that you do not bring your burnt offerings to every place (τόπω) you may see, but rather to the same place (τόπον) which the Lord your God chose.²⁰⁵

The “place” is interpreted as Jerusalem in Jewish traditions, and one might easily infer a claim to exclusivity from these passages.²⁰⁶ Although we may not find Jewish statements

²⁰⁴ “Gnomic utterances are perhaps also to be regarded as a species of [*oratio recta*] insofar as they are sensed as unaltered, ‘prefabricated’ speech. In some instances there is a formal resemblance to framed [*oratio recta*]” (Bers, *Speech in Speech*, 30). I have expanded the scope to common sayings.

²⁰⁵ See also Deut 12:11: “There will be the *place* that the Lord your God chose,” and 12:18, 21, 26. Elsewhere, see 2 Chr 3:1 (in the *place* which David prepared); 7:12, 15 (“I chose this *place*... my ears will hear the prayer from this *place*”); 1 Kings 8:29 (“that your eyes may be open... night and day toward the *place* which you said, ‘My name will be there’, that you may hear the prayer which your servant prays toward this *place*”); Ps 132:5 (until I find a *place* for the Lord, a dwelling for the God of Jacob); and in the Davidic covenant scene referring to the temple, 2 Sam 7:10 // 1 Chron. 17:9 (“I will set up a *place* for my people, Israel”). See also LXX Sirach 36:12; 2 Macc. 3:1-2. By contrast the Samaritan Decalogue (Deut 27:3-5) was modified to include a commandment regarding an altar on Mt. Gerizim (Keener, *John*, 1:611).

²⁰⁶ However a second temple in Elephantine (ca. 6th to 4th centuries BCE) rebuilt with permission from Jerusalem, shows that the deuteronomic passages were not always interpreted exclusively.

that align precisely with the saying that the Samaritan cites,²⁰⁷ we have to consider the rhetorical strategy of this type of imputed speech. If she claims that Jewish people in general say, “God is a big green elephant,” Jesus may simply reply that no, in fact nobody says that. To impute speech to another person or group, the statement must sound like that person or group, or the conversation stops before it starts.²⁰⁸ The Samaritan does not seem to want to end the conversation here by mocking or misrepresenting Jesus’ likely position as a Jew. She has been impressed with his special knowledge about her, and addresses him with respect as a prophet (4:19), presenting Jesus with a genuinely felt contradiction that she wants him to resolve. Of course, it is a different question whether the contradiction would plausibly be felt by John’s audience, but here again we can be confident that John wishes to present Jesus’ teaching as a solution to a real problem as far as the audience understands it. It is probable that the Samaritan’s quotation reflects a position to which John responds, not one it creates.

Later in the chapter, Jesus pairs a saying that he credits to the disciples with one of his own (4:35): “Do you not say, ‘Four months yet and the harvest comes’? Behold I

²⁰⁷ Keener (*John*, 1:612-14) provides a number of references to Jerusalem and the temple as an important place to Jews, although most of them have little to do with worship and none are precisely *exclusive*; however, see esp. *Sipra A.M.* par. 6.187.1.1 which depicts all other temples as defiling. Additional temples in Elephantine (ca. 6th to 4th centuries BCE), Leontopolis under Onias III (2nd century BCE), and even occasional tolerance for the Samaritan temple on Gerizim show that the deuteronomic passages were not always interpreted exclusively to Jerusalem.

²⁰⁸ In this way, imputed speech is related to *prosopopoiia*, “the creation of appropriate speech for a person... which is germane to the occasion on which the speech is given” (Myers, “*Prosopopoetics*,” 581-82). Myers continues: “the key aspect of any attributed speech... is *its appropriateness to both the character to whom it is attributed and the situation in which it is delivered*” (emphasis added). That is, for the Samaritan’s citation to be effective, it has to sound like something a first century Jew coming from Judea would say in the context of a debate over the Jerusalem temple and Samaritan worship on Gerizim. On *prosopopoiia* and attributed speech, Myers cites Theon, *Prog.* 68; 84 and Quintilian, *Inst. Or.* 9.2.29-37, among others.

tell you, lift up your eyes and see the fields, that they are white for the harvest.” The form of the question anticipates a positive response that yes, they do say something along these lines. Although strict parallels have not been found, the proverbial character of the quoted phrase is widely noted.²⁰⁹ Linda M. Bridges has recently supported this position in the context of aphorism studies.²¹⁰ Again, it is not that the disciples need to have said this particular proverb,²¹¹ but that they recognize it as traditional and would more or less agree. Jesus sets one saying against another, contradictory statement to test which is true, much like the Samaritan did. Here the second statement is given authoritatively by Jesus while the proverb is left behind.²¹² Incidentally, it should be noted that Jesus has been perceived to collapse the delay of the eschaton in this passage: where others await the “harvest”²¹³ soon yet still after a pre-set amount of time, Jesus tells the disciples that the time of the harvest is already present in his ministry.²¹⁴ Given the right (i.e. agricultural) context, Jesus would probably agree with the proverb; but in the context of his missiological and perhaps eschatological teaching, he refutes it.

²⁰⁹ E.g. Sanders and Mastin, *John*, 151; Lindars, *John*, 195; Köstenberger, *John*, 162; Brown, *John*, 1:174.

²¹⁰ “Aphorisms of Jesus in John: An Illustrative Look at John 4.35,” *JSHP* 9/2 (2011): 207-29. Bridges’ focus is on the aphorism that follows (“lift up your eyes...”) but she differentiates between the function of the aphorism and that of a proverb, which relies on its relatability and *recognizability*.

²¹¹ Although Lindars (*John*, 195) insists that ὑμεῖς is emphatic: “Do *you* not say...?”

²¹² Jesus invokes another proverb in 4:37-38, but there endorses it: “For in this the saying (λόγος) is true, ‘One sows and another reaps’: I sent you to reap for what you have not labored; others have labored, and you have entered into their labor.”

²¹³ The “harvest” is a common missiological image (e.g. Mark 4:1-20 and pars.; Matt 9:37-38; Luke 10:2), but it is also an eschatological one (cp. Matt 13:24-30, 36-43; Rev 14:14-20).

²¹⁴ See Lincoln, *John*, 180: “the conventional agricultural wisdom that there is a period of waiting between sowing and harvesting is overturned here. Just as Jesus’ presence signified that the time of eschatological worship had arrived (cf. v. 23).”

There is one final example where common, traditional language is reflected in speech that Jesus imputes to the Jews. In fact, it seems that incorporating this language forces Jesus into a paraphrase that is somewhat distortive of their position at the story level. In John 8:41 the Jews claim, “We have one (ἓνα) Father, God.” The claim to have *one* father in God conflicts with their *immediately preceding claim* that Abraham is also in some sense their father (8:39; cp. 8:33). Jesus’ paraphrase reflects his own position (that his Father is also God) and distorts theirs:

John 8:54: “If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing. It is my Father who glorifies me, whom you say, ‘He is our God’ (θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστίν).”²¹⁵

In fact the Jews specifically deny that Jesus’ father is their God.²¹⁶ However, Jesus introduces his quotation as general (*say*, not *said*), even if 8:41 is the probable referent in this conversation. Their problematic claim to one father points to the common saying that Jesus is probably invoking the *Shema* as expressed in the LXX.²¹⁷

LXX Deut 6:4: Hear (ἄκουε), Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord (κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν)!

All three of Jesus’ words appear in this passage in the same order. So far in this dispute, Jesus has declared that he says what he *heard* (ἤκουσα) from the one who sent him

²¹⁵ Some good witnesses have, “whom you say that he is *your* God” (P⁶⁶*, κ, D, B*). Along with the correction in P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵, A, C, and the second hand of B read “our God.” Brown (*John*, 1:359) sides with the direct quotation, arguing that it is “less polished and thus more original.” The variant reading also follows a tendency to render troublesome quotations as indirect; see the Appendix.

²¹⁶ Most likely the Johannine “Jews” would not even concede that God is Jesus’ father in the same way as God is theirs, i.e. in the same relationship, since they accuse him of being a Samaritan and demon-possessed (8:48; cf. also 8:16-19, 26-27).

²¹⁷ This connection also noted by Lori Baron, “Interpreting the *Shema*: Liturgy and Identity in the Fourth Gospel,” *ASE* 27/2 (2010): 53-60, esp. 56. Lincoln (*John*, 271-72) and Ridderbos (*John*, 313) note echoes of the *Shema* in 8:41-42 (cp. also, “If God were your Father, you would *love* me” in John 8:42 with “You will *love* the Lord your God...” in Deut 6:5), but not in 8:54.

(identified as his Father, 8:26-27), the truth that he has *heard* (ἤκουσα) from God (8:40) just before they claim to have *one* father in God (8:41). Meanwhile, Jesus tells the Jews they (should) do what they have *heard* (ἠκούσατε) from their father (8:38) and later (8:47), “Whoever is of God *hears* (ἀκούει) the words of God; for this reason you do not *hear* (ἀκούετε), because you are not of God.” Jesus may misrepresent their position, but it is with a purpose: he has alluded to the famous prayer throughout the dispute, and their appeal to “one father” moves him to invoke the *Shema* even more explicitly against them. Unsurprisingly, they do not hear his appeals to his own unity with the Father and instead, within a few verses, attempt to stone him. Although it is easy to breeze past this seemingly innocuous paraphrase, the counter-suit against Jesus’ opponents is augmented by drawing in elements of a gravely important passage from the Law to demonstrate that, as they are about to stone him for failing to follow this particular commandment,²¹⁸ it is actually Jesus’ opponents who do not hear the Lord.

Conclusion

All told 26 cases have ties to pre-Johannine tradition, demonstrable through parallels still preserved in early texts, and we can speculate about additional cases. Sometimes in John DIQ plays the role only of a narrative device, for example when it draws testimonial features into the text (such as the quotations during the blind man’s trial). In these cases we would not expect the quoted phrases necessarily to reflect a

²¹⁸ See Adele Reinhartz, “John 8:31-59 from a Jewish Perspective,” in *Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide* (3 vols.; eds. J.K. Roth and E. Maxwell-Meynard; London: Palgrave, 2001), 2:787-97, esp. 791, who argues that the *Shema* and the first commandment are behind much of the Jewish opposition to Jesus, but does not recognize how John is aware of this and effectively heads off these criticisms by turning them against his opponents.

traditional statement even if, as is the case with Jesus' summary quotation of the Pharisees (9:41, "we *see*"), he uses paraphrase to tie what they have said (9:40, "We are not also *blind*, are we?") to an allusion to Isaiah he has only just made (9:39, "...that those who *see* may become *blind*").²¹⁹

Furthermore, I have restricted the study in this chapter to phrases with parallels to other early Christian literature already detected by modern scholars.²²⁰ This was in part to stave off the threat of "parallelomania," in part to focus on sayings by or about Jesus. Yet if I were to lift the restriction to Christian literature alone, strong arguments could be made for John drawing in pre-Christian Jewish motifs through DIQ. For example, Jesus takes the time to remind his fellow Jews that he had told them, "you will die in your sin(s)" (8:24; cf. 8:21). Shortly thereafter he launches into an argument that their claims to righteous fathers, whether Abraham or God, are immaterial if they do not *behave* like their fathers (8:37-47). Of the possible allusions evoked by the phrase quoted in 8:24 is the following:²²¹

Deut 24:16: Fathers will not be put to death for their sons, and sons will not be put to death for their fathers. Every man will die in his own sin.

The law is stated negatively—I cannot be punished for my father's crimes, and he cannot be punished for mine—but it serves to disentangle the righteousness of one generation from another. Abraham cannot be put to death for the sins of the present generation since

²¹⁹ See chapter 3 above on this verse. "I came into this world for judgment, so that those not seeing may see, and those who see may become blind" alludes to Isa. 6:9-10, a text explicitly cited in John 12:40.

²²⁰ Exceptions were John 4:20 and 8:54, which are presented in John as something the Jews say.

²²¹ But compare LXX Prov. 24:9: "A fool dies in sins" (ἀποθνήσκει δὲ ἄφρων ἐν ἁμαρτίαις).

after all he is already dead (8:52-53). But neither can his righteousness protect the present generation since “every man dies in his own sin.” Jesus seems to anticipate the argument by alluding to a law dealing with the sins of fathers and sons,²²² then drawing particular attention to it by repeating it twice more.

Other allusions to Jewish writings could be found in John’s quotations, both from writings that we now consider normative (i.e. the OT) and in other streams of Jewish writing. Furthermore, both Theobald and Noack remark on similarities between John’s citations of Scripture and John’s citations *of John*.²²³ First of all, the scriptural citations are phrased in terms of what was once *said* almost as often as they refer to what was *written*.²²⁴ A primary example helps to equate the authority of Jesus’ word and that of Scripture:²²⁵

²²² The first clause in the LXX reads, “Fathers will not be put to death for *children* (τέκνων)” (the second clause has “sons”); cp. 8:39: “Our father is Abraham.” Jesus said to them, “If you were *children* (τέκνα) of Abraham, you would do Abraham’s works.”

²²³ Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 42-47; Noack (*Tradition*, 71-103, 157-61) is less direct, but draws several of the same conclusions regarding the scriptural citations as he does regarding the internal quotations, most importantly that the inaccuracies in both types of citation are not intentional but a byproduct of John’s oral tradition.

²²⁴ For what was said, see John 1:23; 7:38, 42; 12:38, 40; 19:37; and 12:34 is marked as something the crowd heard, so probably should be put in this category. For what was written, see 2:17; 6:31, 45; 8:17; 10:34; 12:14; 15:25. Three others are marked only as fulfilled: 13:18; 19:24, 36. I have ignored 17:12 and 19:28 because they only refer to Scripture being fulfilled without necessarily citing it.

²²⁵ See also John 18:32 for a similar fulfillment formula and 2:22 for an equivalence of Scripture and Jesus’ word as things to be believed. Moloney (“The Gospel of John as Scripture,” *CBQ* 67/3 [2005]: 454-68) argues that 18:9 refers back to 17:12 (spoken to fulfill Scripture), and that 18:32 refers back to 12:32-33: “The close juxtaposition of 17:12 and 18:9 enables the author to draw a parallel between ἡ γραφή and ὁ λόγος... many have suggested that LXX Isa 52:13 (ὁψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα) is behind the Johannine use of ὁψόω. If this is the case, then ἡ γραφή and ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ coalesce across 3:14; 8:28; 12:[32-]33; 18:32.” That is, according to Moloney, the Fourth Gospel discursively presents itself as Scripture, specifically the fulfillment or *completion* (ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, John 19:28) of Scripture.

John 18:8-9: Jesus replied... so that the word he said might be fulfilled, “I lost not one of those you have given me.”²²⁶

In form, this is remarkably like the citation formulas later in the gospel, beginning with a citation of Isaiah:

John 12:38: They did not believe in him, so that the word Isaiah the prophet said might be fulfilled, “Lord, who believed our report? And to whom was the arm of the Lord revealed?”²²⁷

The citation matches LXX Isa. 53:1 precisely, rare for John and especially notable at 12 words long. The same cannot be said for the following citation, still largely covered by the previous introductory formula:

John 12:40: Because again Isaiah said, “He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that they may not see with the eyes and understand with the heart, and they turn and I will heal them.”²²⁸

LXX Isa 6:10: For the heart of this people has been fattened, and they hear with heavy ears, and they shut their eyes lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand with their heart and they turn and I will heal them.²²⁹

Of 23 words in the citation, only 15 (~65%) find a match in LXX Isa 6:10, with ten of them articles, pronouns, and conjunctions, and even then not in the same order. Appeals to the Hebrew do not fare much better.²³⁰ By contrast Matthew (13:14-15) cites 47 words

²²⁶ The introduction formula reads: ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν ὅτι.

²²⁷ The introduction formula reads: ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν.

²²⁸ The citation reads: Τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

²²⁹ The line reads: ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ὡσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὡσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

²³⁰ See Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* (SBLDS 133; Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 94-105. John’s ἵνα μὴ is perhaps closer to the MT’s $\text{וְ$ than μήποτε in the LXX, but ἵνα is a favorite conjunction of

from Isa 6:9-10 and all of them are found in the Septuagint.²³¹ Noack argues that John is inexact because the author cites from memory.²³² It is possible, even likely, but unnecessary. John paraphrases Isaiah as it does Jesus:²³³ in place of the people closing their own eyes, *he/it* (the Father? Jesus? the report [cf. 12:38]?) has blinded their eyes (recalling the allusion to Isaiah in John 9:39-41)²³⁴ and, like Pharaoh before them, *he* has hardened their heart.²³⁵ God's, and through God Christ's, absolute control over the situation is asserted even as the threats against Jesus mount—themes that are paramount to the Fourth Gospel and that are worked even into a citation of Scripture. Seventeen explicit citations of Scripture appear in John ranging from three to 23 words long;

John's and it uses ἵνα μὴ 11 times elsewhere (cf. 3:20; 4:15; 5:14; 6:12; 7:23; 16:1; 18:28, 36; 19:31, and two cases immediately surrounding the citation, 12:35, 42; cf. also the allusion to Isaiah in 9:39, ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες; μήποτε appears only in 7:26), so we cannot be sure of an independent translation (here Schuchard follows M.J.J. Menken, "Die Form des Zitates aus Jes 6,10 in Joh 12,40," *BZ* 32 [1988]: 189-209). John is not likely to use νοήσωσιν instead of συνίημι in the LXX as an independent translation of רָבִין: John has a marked preference for οἶδα and γινώσκω, using them over 100 times total, whereas νοέω appears only here, most likely borrowed from the quite similar LXX Isa 44:18 (as Schuchard notes).

²³¹ Matthew does omit one αὐτῶν. Acts 28:26-27 cites 54 words of the same passage, including the introductory command to Isaiah which Acts modifies in four words so that only 50 (~93%) are found exactly in Isaiah. The same αὐτῶν is absent. Mark 4:12 and Luke 8:10 are more allusions than citations.

²³² Noack, *Tradition*, 71-89; cp. Charles Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?", *JBL* 73/2 (1954): 61-75.

²³³ Compare the analyses of Menken and Schuchard (e.g. *Scripture within Scripture*, xv: "deviations in biblical citations... are frequently the result of the conscious application of established exegetical techniques... Evident in John's editorial activity is an exegetical procedure already well-established in first-century Judaism").

²³⁴ Recall 9:40, "We are not also *blind*, are we?" Compare 9:39, "I came into the world for judgment," with 12:46-48, "I have come into the world as light [cp. 9:5]... I do not *judge* anyone... for I did not come to *judge* the world, but to save the world. The one who rejects me and does not receive my words has one who *judges* him: the word that I spoke, that *judges* him on the last day." An additional link is provided by the threat to expel confessors from the synagogue (9:22; 12:42).

²³⁵ The allusion to Pharaoh should not be overemphasized, not only because hardening of hearts is a common phrase but also because a variant reading, "he mutilated (ἐπήρωσεν) their heart," has strong attestation beginning with the Bodmer papyri, which Menken takes to be original ("Joh 12,40"). If so the change may have been intentional, but variations going the other way, πωρόω to πηρόω, appear elsewhere, so that it may have been a common mistake with a resultant phrase that sounded fine in context.

ignoring abridgements, three of them (~18%) are exact to the LXX.²³⁶ Others use all of the familiar forms of paraphrase: omissions,²³⁷ additions,²³⁸ transpositions,²³⁹ and substitutions.²⁴⁰ John has at most 44 verifiable quotations ranging from one word to at most 14;²⁴¹ ignoring subtractions, 17 (~39%) are exact.²⁴² So John is actually more exact when citing its own text, even if the discrepancies stand out more with the text and pre-text

²³⁶ Here I follow the useful survey in von Wahlde, *John*, 3:295-323. In what follows, I choose only the proposed parallel that accounts for the greatest number of John's cited words.

²³⁷ The citation of Zech 9:9 at John 12:14-15 simplifies the double description of the animal ("an ass and [or: which is] a young foal" becomes "foal of a donkey"), and much of the rest is streamlined by omissions (von Wahlde [*John*, 3:307] agrees with Freed that John "included only the essentials").

²³⁸ The most notable occurring in the first citation in John 1:23, of Isa 40:3, which adds ἐγώ to identify the Baptist with the Voice that cries out. On the paraphrastic substitution of "straighten" for "prepare" later in the citation, see Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 11-15.

²³⁹ There are several transpositions in John 12:40-41 from Isa 6:10, both minor (τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν becomes αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς) and major: the references to eyes and heart are not only modified, they are inverted, creating a neater parallelism after John's omissions break up an original chiasm (Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 93): "He blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that their eyes may not see and their heart may not understand."

²⁴⁰ Notable cases include "the Messiah" (John 12:34) for "his [David's] seed" (LXX Ps 88:37), τρώγω (John 13:18) for ἐσθίω (LXX Ps 40:10), and a shift from aorist ("consumed," LXX Ps 68:10) to future ("zeal for your house *will* consume me," John 2:17) to allow a reference to Jesus' still future execution. Matthew W. Bates (*The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Inter-pretation* [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2012], 245-46) briefly examines John's citation of LXX Ps 68:10 as an example of "prosopological exegesis," where an ambiguous speaker in Scripture is given a suitable persona while making the declaration (and in this way is closely related to *prosopopoiia*; see above, n. 208): here "me" from the psalm becomes Jesus during the temple incident. Often within this type of exegesis past tense (aorist or perfect) verbs can be read as referring to a future moment, for example when Hebrews 1:9 applies LXX Ps 44:7-8 ("God *anointed* you") to Jesus' life, centuries after the psalm was written, and as Paul applies the second half of LXX Ps 68:10 to Christ ("insults... *fell* on me"; Rom 15:3). However at the presumed historical moment that John applies the psalm to Jesus, he has *yet to be consumed* and so John can change the tense of the verb to fit the assumed point in time (outside of such a narrative context, the aorist could normally apply to Jesus even though the events occurred long after the psalm was composed). For more on how John plays with verb tense and temporal perspective in quotations of Jesus' words, see chapter 5 below.

²⁴¹ It is unclear whether a second "me" should be included in 7:34, 36. If so, the quotation is 14 words long. Either way, ignoring subtractions the quotation is exact until the 9th century.

²⁴² Another five of them (3:28a; 4:17; 5:12; 12:34; 13:11) introduce no new words or grammatical forms, although they omit and rearrange words from the original statement.

side-by-side. Put otherwise, John may cite Scripture from memory or indeed from his own translations or as influenced by Targums in addition to using something like the Septuagint, but many of the differences can be explained as paraphrases similar to those of Jesus within the Fourth Gospel. Since Jesus' word is given similar weight to Scripture and yet John paraphrases Jesus often, it also paraphrases Scripture as needed.

Table 9. The Extent of John's Paraphrase with Scripture and in DIQ

| | Scripture | John |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------|
| Shortest citation (number of words) | 3 | 1 |
| Longest citation (number of words) | 23 | 14 |
| Average citation (number of words) | 8.82 | 5.73 |
| Average exact ratio | 58% | 73% |

Along similar lines to Theobald, Peder Borgen has examined how John paraphrases Scripture within the gospel to elaborate on it in the Johannine context. He compares how John develops a scriptural citation in John 6:31 with how it develops the logion in John 3:3 through a question and answer format that is used also by Philo (see *Mut.* 1.142b-44 on Gen 17:16) and *Mekilta* on Exod 12:2.²⁴³ A logion is brought in and expounded, in one case, "Unless someone is born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God," and in the other, "He gave them bread from heaven to eat," where Jesus identifies himself with the bread (6:35; cp. 6:33, 38) and then the bread with his flesh (6:51).²⁴⁴ Each position causes an interpretive problem, and an objection is raised that adapts Jesus' language and paraphrases what Jesus has said:

²⁴³ Borgen, "Independence," 1824-28. The following will build on and expand Borgen's argument.

²⁴⁴ Borgen continues to view the discourse as a unified homily through to 6:58 and so skips over the identification of Jesus with the bread to focus on the problem caused by Jesus' cannibalistic language in 6:51-58. However, for the people of Capernaum Jesus' claims to be from Heaven are just as problematic as the

John 6:42: “Is this not Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How (πῶς) does he now say, ‘*I have descended from heaven*’?”

John 6:52: “How can (πῶς δύναται) this one *give us flesh to eat*?”

John 3:4: “How can (πῶς δύναται) a person, being old, *be born*? He *cannot* (μὴ δύναται) enter into his mother’s belly *a second time* and *be born*, can he?”

In response, Jesus elaborates through paraphrase:

John 6:51: “*I am the living bread that descended from heaven. If someone eats of this bread, he will live eternally; and the bread that I give for the life of the world is my flesh.*”

John 6:53: “Amen, amen I say to you, unless you *eat the flesh* of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you do not have *life* in yourselves.”²⁴⁵

John 3:5-8: “Amen, amen I say to you, unless someone is *born* of water and *of Spirit*, he *cannot enter* into the Kingdom of God. That which is *born* of flesh is flesh, and that which is *born of spirit* is spirit. Do not be amazed that I told you, ‘You must *be born from above*’. The *wind* (πνεῦμα) blows where it wills and you hear its sound, but you do not know from where it is or where it goes; so it is with everyone *born of the Spirit*.”

The elaborative moves are remarkably similar. John begins with a traditional saying, in John 6 a line from Exodus cited by the crowd and in John 3, according to Borgen, something like Matt 18:3, although he maintains John’s independence of the Synoptics. John then interprets the saying first, in John 6 by having Jesus identify himself with the bread, and then again by interpreting the bread as his flesh, and in John 3 by reformulating

cannibalistic (or simply Eucharistic) language is for Jesus’ disciples (6:60-66). There are two expositions dealing with two different problems, but following similar formats.

²⁴⁵ Notice that Jesus summarizes his previous discussion in 6:51 and introduces a new elaboration, linking *life* to his *flesh*. In their paraphrase in 6:52, the Jews fail to pick up “life,” instead focusing on *eating flesh*. Jesus picks up these terms in his response, but reintroduces “life” and reapplies it from “someone” (τις) directly to “you” (ὁμῖν, φάγητε). The same move is made in 3:3, 5 (τις) and 3:7 (ὁμῶς).

“becoming like children” as “being born from above/of water and of Spirit.”²⁴⁶ The Jews, or one of their rulers, then voice a potential objection incorporating the language Jesus used *in his reformulation*.²⁴⁷ They object to the interpretation, not to the teaching itself. Finally Jesus elaborates on the disputed terms, such as eating his flesh or being born from above, paraphrasing himself as he does so.

Borgen detects similar patterns in John’s “disruption of the temple,” elaborating the evidently traditional logion in John 2:19 (“Destroy this temple...”), objected to in 2:20 and elaborated (by the narrator) in 2:21-22.²⁴⁸ Something similar appears to be happening when John 5:10-18 (containing two quotations) is appended to a core miracle story in 5:1-9 (containing a logion evident in the tradition; see above).

Borgen’s model is a variant of similar three-part structures detected by other Johannine scholars over the last century: Jesus makes a statement, someone else voices an incorrect or at least limited interpretation, and Jesus paraphrases—himself and their interpretation—in order to clarify the statement or broaden its application. Some have described the sequences as *statement-misunderstanding-clarification*, while others influ-

²⁴⁶ There is a double reapplication of a traditional motif in John 3:3, 5 (born from above *and* of the Spirit), just as there is in John 6. In John 3, though, the reapplications are more intertwined. The last word of Nicodemus, “How can (πῶς δύναται) these things be?” is an additional sign of this double reapplication.

²⁴⁷ As was discussed in chapter 2 above, “from heaven” appears in the scriptural citation and is picked up by Jesus, but “descended” is introduced by Jesus, as is his use of himself as the subject of the verb, and the phrasing, “I am” (cf. 6:41). For the second elaboration, the Jews pick up “flesh” from 6:51 (where it appears for the first time). Nicodemus picks up “being born” (twice) from Jesus’ reformulation and paraphrases “from above” as “a second time.”

²⁴⁸ Borgen, “Independence,” 1830-31. Statement: “Destroy *this sanctuary* and *in three days I will raise it*.” Objection: “*This sanctuary* has been *built up* in 46 years, and *you will raise* (i.e. rebuild) *it in three days*?” Clarification (for post-resurrection audience only): But he said this concerning *the sanctuary* of his body. Then when *he was raised* (i.e. resurrected) *from the dead* (i.e. how the sanctuary was destroyed), his disciples remembered that he said this.

enced by the social sciences use the model of *statement-challenge-riposte* to incorporate the ways in which Jesus' honor is challenged in these exchanges.²⁴⁹ Thatcher's riddling sessions also follow this pattern with the model, *riddle-confusion-answer*. Each of these variants on the three-part interpretive structure offer important insights into the several ways that John uses it, but my interest in Borgen's model derives from the fact that he examines specifically how John uses *paraphrase* in the context of interpretations over *pre-gospel* material.

In the next chapter, we will expand on Borgen's observations since there are other cases where John uses DIQ in this manner. What is important to note here is that DIQ has been found to incorporate and modify evidently traditional material in over two dozen cases. This is already highly suggestive that one of the main functions of DIQ as a device is to draw in and comment upon traditional ideas. Borgen's analysis shows that John elaborates these sayings in a way that is quite similar to how the Fourth Gospel reinterprets and elaborates material taken from Scripture. Together a strong case is made that when John elaborates on a saying using DIQ it is quite likely to be traditional even if we cannot find close parallels in the literature that survives. Indeed it may be an idea traditional only within Johannine circles. It then becomes important to note where the saying starts and where it is moved to understand how John is using its traditions. In the next chapter, we will closely observe how John addresses Jesus' cosmic movements out of the

²⁴⁹ See Neyrey, *John*, 13 for the former, and the useful survey of literature on the pattern prior to 1980 in D.A. Carson, "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel," *Tyndale Bulletin* 33 (1982): 59-91. Neyrey also uses the model of challenge and riposte (e.g. on John 2:13-22; see *John*, 71-72) when honor is challenged, but see also Neyrey's sometime collaborators, Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998).

world (through death and ascension) and back into the world in a variety of ways (through resurrection, *parousia*, and spiritual presence in the church) through similar interpretive means in order to make the argument for Jesus' real presence in the community without downplaying the reality of the resurrection or of the eschatological advent of the Son of Man.

Table 10. Summary of Quoted Johannine Statements with Outside Parallels

| Quoted Statements in John | Proposed Outside Parallels |
|--|---|
| 1:20: " <i>I am not the Christ</i> " (cp. 3:28) | Acts 13:25: " <i>I am not he</i> " |
| 1:27: " <i>One is coming after me, of whom I am not worthy that I should loosen the strap of his sandal</i> " (cp. 1:15, 30) | Acts 13:25: " <i>Behold he comes after me of whom I am not worthy to loosen the sandal of his feet</i> " (cp. Mark 1:7-8; Matt 3:11; Luke 3:16) |
| 1:33: " <i>On whomever you see the Spirit descending</i> (1:32: like a dove) and remaining on him, this is the one who baptizes in Holy Spirit" | Mark 1:8, 10: " <i>He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit</i> "... <i>he saw the heavens torn apart and the Spirit descending like a dove on him</i> (cp. Matt 3:11, 16; Luke 3:16, 22) |
| 1:34: " <i>This is the Son of God</i> " | Matt 3:17: " <i>This is my Son, the beloved</i> " (cp. Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22) |
| 3:3: " <i>Amen, amen I say to you, unless someone is born from above, he cannot see</i> (3:5: <i>enter</i>) <i>the Kingdom of God</i> " (cp. 3:7) | Matt 18:3: " <i>Amen I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will not enter the Kingdom of Heaven</i> " (cp. Mark 10:15; Luke 18:17; Gos. Thom. 46) |
| 3:3: " <i>Amen, amen I say to you, unless someone is born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God</i> " (cp. 3:7) | Mark 9:1: " <i>Amen I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death until they see the Kingdom of God having come with power</i> " (cp. Matt 16:28; Luke 9:27) |
| 3:14: " <i>The Son of Man must be lifted up</i> " (cp. 8:28; 12:32, 34) | Mark 8:31: " <i>The Son of Man must suffer many things... and be killed, and after three days rise up</i> " (cp. Matt 16:21; Luke 9:22) |
| 3:28: " <i>I am sent ahead of him</i> " | Luke 7:27: " <i>Behold, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way ahead of you</i> " (cp. Matt 11:10) |
| 4:44: " <i>A prophet does not have honor in his own fatherland</i> " | Mark 6:4: " <i>A prophet is not without honor except in his fatherland</i> " (cp. Matt 13:54; Luke 4:24; Gos. Thom. 31) |
| 5:8: " <i>Rise, carry your bed and walk!</i> " (cp. 5:11, 12) | Mark 2:9: " <i>Rise and carry your bed and walk!</i> " (cp. Mark 2:10-11; Matt 9:5, 6; Luke 5:23, 24) |
| 7:20: " <i>You have a demon</i> " (cp. 8:48; 10:20) | Mark 3:20: " <i>He has Beelzbul</i> " (cp. Mark 3:30; Matt 10:25; 12:24; Luke 11:15-19) |
| 8:31-32: " <i>If you remain in my word, you will truly be my disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will free you</i> " (cp. 8:33) | Luke 14:26-27: " <i>If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father... he cannot be my disciple</i> "/Gal 4:8; 5:1: <i>Formerly you did not know God... [but] for freedom Christ freed us</i> |
| 8:51: " <i>Amen, amen I say to you, if anyone keeps my word, he will not see</i> (8:52: <i>taste</i>) <i>death forever</i> " | Mark 9:1: " <i>Amen I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death until they see the Kingdom of God having come with power</i> " (cp. Matt 16:28; Luke 9:27; Gos. Thom. Prologue) |

Table 10. Summary of Quoted Johannine Statements with Outside Parallels (cont.)

| Quoted Statements in John | Proposed Outside Parallels |
|---|--|
| 10:33: "We do not stone you concerning a good work but concerning <i>blasphemy</i> " (cp. 10:36) | Mark 14:64: "You heard the <i>blasphemy</i> !" (cp. Matt 26:65) |
| 10:36: " <i>I am God's Son</i> " | Matt 27:63: " <i>I am God's Son</i> " |
| 11:50: "It is better for you that one person should <i>die for the people</i> , so that the whole nation should not perish" (cp. 11:51-52; 18:14) | Rom 5:8: Christ <i>died for us</i> (cp. Mark 14:24; Matt 26:28; 1 Cor 11:24; 15:3; 2 Cor 5:14; Gal 1:4; Heb 2:9) |
| 13:16: " <i>A slave is not greater than his master</i> " (cp. 15:20) | Matt 10:24: "A student <i>is not above</i> the teacher, nor <i>a slave above his master</i> " (cp. Luke 6:40) |
| 14:18: " <i>I am coming to you</i> " (cp. 14:28) | Rev 2:5: " <i>I am coming to you</i> " (cp. Rev 2:16; 3:11; 16:15; 22:7, 12, 20) |
| 18:4-5: "Whom do you seek?" They replied to him, "Jesus the Nazorean." He said to them, " <i>I am</i> ." (cp. 18:6, 8) | Mark 14:61-62: "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?" And Jesus said, " <i>I am</i> " |
| 19:21: " <i>I am the Jews' King</i> " | Mark 15:26: Jesus of Nazareth, <i>King of the Jews</i> (cp. Matt 27:37; Luke 23:38) |

CHAPTER 5

DIRECT INTERNAL QUOTATION AND THE COSMIC MOVEMENTS OF JESUS

The Messiah will come only when he is no longer necessary; he will come only on the day after his arrival; he will come, not on the last day, but on the very last.

Franz Kafka, "The Coming of the Messiah"¹

Introduction

The principal goal of our examination so far has been to understand the various ways that direct internal quotation functions in John's gospel, if only because it is used so frequently and consistently throughout the narrative. In the second chapter we examined the variations between verifiable quotations and the original reported speech act. Previous scholarship had determined that the fact of variation was notable, but that the variations themselves did little to change the sense of the quoted statements. By contrast, examining DIQ in the context of Greek education and of other ancient literature suggests the opposite assessment. The fact of variation in quotation is hardly notable since it is the rule, not the exception. That the paraphrases can often be heard with roughly the same sense as the quoted statement is not surprising: a radical and noticeable modification would violate the rules of paraphrase. Instead, minor alterations are made in order to shift emphasis, draw in context, focus the discussion, or clarify a past statement. Paying

¹ "The Coming of the Messiah" found in *Parables and Paradoxes* (Nahum N. Glatzer, ed.; New York: Schocken Books, 1961), 81. This fragment of Kafka's parable is not presented because his understanding of the Messiah is particularly Johannine, but because of the triple repetition that "he will come." The present chapter will argue that the Gospel of John uses DIQ to argue also for a triple advent of Christ.

attention to these minor alterations may tell us a considerable amount about how the authors understood the various sayings or how they wished to present the argument.

In the third chapter we examined the broader roles that DIQ plays within the Fourth Gospel. Direct internal quotation allows both the characters (at the story level) and the authors (at the discursive or narrative level) to return to themes that need clarification, to eliminate misunderstandings, and to broaden the possible understandings of a given teaching or claim. The device also contributes to the characterization of the Fourth Gospel as a forensic text, with DIQ playing the role of testimony. Again this occurs both at the level of the story, as when the Baptist testifies on behalf of Jesus through quotation, and at the level of the narrative, as when the narrator uses DIQ to characterize the Jews as Jesus' legal opponents who intimidate witnesses and fail to follow proper legal procedures. While the Johannine trial motif is a major motivator for using DIQ, even in that discussion it was noted that DIQ can also serve a pedagogical function. Most of the quotations used in the trial motif arguably serve both functions: they make the case for Jesus in his ongoing trial with the Jews while also teaching the audience proper understandings of Jesus' words. Since we will examine material for the most part from the farewell discourse in this chapter, the weight will shift considerably from the juridical to the pedagogical. Still, some of John's interpretations—and defenses against interpretations—may reflect contemporary disputes with other groups or sub-groups. Below I will support another, less literary role for DIQ as a protection against interpretations that diverge too widely from the traditional teachings of Jesus as understood by the group.

Finally in the previous chapter we examined evidence for DIQ as a meta-textual device used to incorporate traditional, pre-Johannine material in order to endorse, correct,

or add to it. Most of that examination was done empirically—a significant amount of the quoted material has strong parallels with pre- or at least non-Johannine material found in other early texts. Often the paraphrases shift the statement in a direction that John wants to push it. In the rare cases that the quotation moves the statement closer to pre-Johannine tradition, as it arguably does in 8:52 or 12:34, John perhaps does so in order to correct what was perceived as a misunderstanding held by other Christ-followers. At the end of that discussion similarities were noted between how John uses DIQ to interpret words of Jesus, and how John uses paraphrase with scriptural citations to interpret Scripture, under the model advocated by Peder Borgen. Below we will examine cases that involve his three-part, paraphrastic structure but where the three parts are not contiguous. Direct internal quotation is often the device that allows Jesus or his audience to return to this material and take it up a second (or a third) time.

Now that we have built up these observations on the roles of DIQ, it is time to apply them to a narrower set of statements. The main object of study in this chapter will be verses in which Jesus discusses his cosmic movements which have been variously interpreted to refer to his original descent into the world, his departure from the world in death and ascension to the Father, and his return to the world in resurrection, in *parousia*, and through the Spirit into the body of the church. By following the use of DIQ to repeat and reinterpret logia regarding Jesus' cosmic movements, John negotiates the various applications of these sayings, emphasizing in particular the coming of Christ into the present life of the church without eliminating the resurrection or the *parousia* as legitimate interpretations.

Final and Realized Eschatology

The eschatology of the Fourth Gospel carries with it a tension that is not neatly resolvable: what exactly is Jesus' temporal perspective when he speaks, especially in the farewell discourse? And when exactly does John imagine certain predictions being fulfilled? Declarations about judgment, resurrection and life, and Jesus' cosmic movements, are applied to the present and to the future, often side by side. It is possible to argue that "realized" eschatological statements like 5:24-25 ("anyone who hears my word... *has* eternal life") and "final" eschatological statements like 5:28-29 ("the hour is coming when all those in the tombs... *will* come out") are complementary, but for some scholars such arguments are so much special pleading because there is simply no way to resolve the differing viewpoints evident in John 5:25-29.²

A variety of diachronic solutions (where verses with final eschatology are put to the side because they are either remnants of earlier eschatological thinking or an accommodation to more popular eschatology)³ and synchronic solutions (where the entire gos-

² For example, von Wahlde, *John*, 2:238, where the verses are credited to two different authors: "This is a contrast between realized and future eschatology... Not only do they reflect different theological conceptions, but they also reflect distinct worldviews." By contrast, see Harold W. Attridge, "From Discord Rises Meaning: Resurrection Motifs in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John* (WUNT 222; ed. R. Bieringer and C.R. Koester; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008), 1-19, here 7: "The intricate interplay between the 'realized' and 'future' aspects of resurrection, within which Jesus can so fully imitate the Father, may possibly be the result of redactional activity; but if so, what has the redactor achieved? The references to a 'realized' eschatology stand and have not been eliminated by the affirmation of a future resurrection. Would a reader notice the tension and be surprised by it?... Or might she simply be confused, 'wondering' (5:28) how the eschatological hope works?"

³ For the former, see C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 405-6 and throughout; M.-E. Boismard, "L'évolution du thème eschatologique dans les traditions johanniques," *RB* 68/4 (1961): 507-24; and Jürgen Becker, "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu im Johannesevangelium," *ZNW* 61 (1970): 215-46. For the latter, Jörg Frey provides a brief survey ("Eschatology in the Johannine Circle," in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel* [BETL 184; eds. G. van Belle, J.G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz; Leuven: Peeters, 2005], 47-84, here 49 n. 5), but see also the commentaries by Schnackenburg, Thyen, and von Wahlde.

pel is read through the lens of either realized or final eschatology) have been sought.⁴

None have garnered a broad consensus.⁵ If the final authors of the Gospel of John perceived the tension (and it is not clear they viewed it as such), then apparently they did not find it significant or perhaps overwhelming of other concerns.

Increasingly the field of Johannine scholars has tried to find ways of reading final and realized eschatological statements in John together in a more nuanced and interactive way.⁶ Brown was an early advocate of allowing both types of eschatology to stand, recognizing that passages with final eschatology “are often doublets of other passages where the same words of Jesus are interpreted in terms of realized eschatology,” but never outright rejected.⁷ The most comprehensive and thorough example of this school is

⁴ For the former, see Ernst Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in Light of Chapter 17* (trans. G. Krodel; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), Robert Kysar, “The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel: A Correction of Bultmann’s Redactional Hypothesis,” *Perspective* 13/1 (1972): 23-33, and more recently, Hans-Christian Kammler, *Christologie und Eschatologie: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Joh 5,17-30* (WUNT 126; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) and Theobald, *Herrenworte*. For a rare attempt at reading John entirely through the lens of final eschatology, see Lodewijk van Hartingsveld, *Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit R. Bultmann* (VGTB 36; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962).

⁵ A comment by David Rensberger (“The Messiah Who Has Come into the World: The Message of the Gospel of John,” in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* [R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher, eds.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001], 15-23, here 20) is especially apt: “Whether one considers the passages that speak of a resurrection on the last day... as an earlier layer of futuristic eschatology overwritten by [the Fourth Evangelist]’s strongly realized eschatology, or as a later redactional reversion to the standard futuristic eschatology of the church, or as a promise to carry out an act that has in essence already been accomplished, it is clear that the eschatological weight in [the Fourth Gospel] falls on the coming of Jesus himself” (emphasis added).

⁶ Here the study by Jan van der Watt, “Eschatology in John: A Continuous Process of Realizing Events,” in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (WUNT 2.315; ed. J.G. van der Watt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 109-40, is particularly helpful. Van der Watt not only highlights that “John’s eschatology is neither exclusively futurist nor realized” (p. 124), he also focuses on the role that one’s presumed temporal perspective plays on how certain eschatological statements are heard, and on the communal nature of much of John’s eschatology: “Eschatological life is here and now and stretches into the future—it is the continuous life in the family of God” (pp. 123-24).

⁷ Brown, *John*, 1:cxxi.

Jörg Frey's three volume study, *Die johanneische Eschatologie*.⁸ Especially in his examination of the farewell discourse (John 13:31-14:31), Frey attempts to balance how John addresses the pre-resurrection time of the story and the post-resurrection time of the audience.⁹ Meanwhile final eschatology, including the *parousia* of Christ on the last day, is treated as a real part of John's *Gemeindetradition*. John is just as aware of the distinction between past and present (the coming of Christ in birth and resurrection, and the spiritual advent of Christ in the church) as it is the distinction between present and future, but balances these with an emphasis on the similarity of the various temporal moments.¹⁰ Thus

⁸ *Die johanneische Eschatologie* (WUNT 96, 110, 117; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997, 1998, 2000). The first volume is an extensive survey of positions on Johannine eschatology since H.S. Reimarus (d. 1768), providing a much more extensive bibliography than is found here. The second volume is a dissertation on the Johannine understanding of time. The third volume details Frey's model for understanding eschatology in the Fourth Gospel. Earlier, see Ingo Broer, "Auferstehung und ewiges Leben im Johannesevangelium," in *"Auf Hoffnung hin sind wir erlöst" (Röm 8,24): Biblische und systematische Beiträge zum Erlösungsverständnis heute* (SBS 128; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987), 67-94.

⁹ See Frey, *Eschatologie*, 2:248 and throughout. See also Ridderbos, *John*, 475: "we are struck by the strong salvation-historical discontinuity that is posited in the Fourth Gospel between the modes of existence of the earthly and the heavenly Jesus." I would suggest that the discontinuity is not so much "posited" by John as it is *acknowledged* and in some ways mitigated by John.

¹⁰ In support of the distinction of times, Oscar Cullmann (*Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History* [rev. ed.; trans. F.V. Filson; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964], 168) stresses the distinction between past and present through the roles and character of Christ's presence. By asserting John's temporal distinctions, I am in disagreement with Bultmann's famous line, "for John, Easter, Pentecost, and the Parousia are not three separate events, but one and the same" (*Theology of the New Testament* [trans. K. Grobel; 2 vols.; New York: Scribner, 1965], 2:82; based on a similar formulation by Wilhelm Heitmüller, "Das Evangelium des Johannes," in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* [2 vols.; ed. J. Weiss; 2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908], 2:685-861; here 829: "Das Kommen des Geistes ist Ostern und Pfingsten zugleich—und endlich auch das (wieder)—Kommen Jesu (die Parusie), das man als Abschluss dieser Zeit erwartet"). Hans-Ulrich Weidemann ("Eschatology as Liturgy: Jesus' Resurrection and Johannine Eschatology," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John* [WUNT 222; ed. R. Bieringer and C.R. Koester; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008], 277-310, here 290-91) counters this idea: "from the very beginning of the Farewell Discourse, the readers (or hearers) of the text are reminded that their situation is *fundamentally different* from that of the figures in the story... This *fundamental difference*... is intended to oppose an all too quick identification of the two audiences," although "'Easter' and 'Parousia' traditions creatively influence each other" (emphasis original).

much of the same language can be applied to each of them.¹¹ Below we will focus on how John uses DIQ to maintain such a balance with regard to Christ's various advents (his resurrection, *parousia*, and his present coming through the Spirit into the church) by paraphrasing and reapplying traditional statements about Jesus *coming*.

Before we begin that examination, something needs to be said about the function of the farewell discourse (John 13:31-17:26),¹² where many of these statements appear, and the possibility that John's realized eschatology evinces signs of early Christian prophetism or visionary activity. I do not wish to get into the wide-ranging discussions about how precisely the farewell discourse is laid out or how neatly it matches extrapolated ideals of the farewell genre(s).¹³ One general observation I will make here has to do with the similarity between the first section of the discourse (13:31-14:31) and a later section (16:4b-33). Both have to do with Jesus' departure, addressing the topic in much

¹¹ Conversely put, to whatever extent John records genuine Jesus tradition—and it is quite possible that some of the quoted material in John does go back to traditions stemming from Jesus, although the current study is not equipped to draw these conclusions with anything remotely approaching certainty—I might state it differently: early Christians sought out appropriate applications (or fulfillments) of enigmatic statements about Jesus' departure and return, and found his resurrection, *parousia*, and spiritual presence in the church to be variously adequate.

¹² Some would include 13:1-30 within the same block of material (e.g. John Carlson Stube, *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse* [LNTS 309; London: T&T Clark, 2006], as a *narratio*). It is certainly connected to the discourse, but the earlier passage focuses much more on Jesus' actions than does the rest of the farewell material, and more to the point there is a change in audience as Judas Iscariot leaves the room in 13:30. Second, many refer to the farewell *discourses*, dividing the scene into four or more parts (e.g. 13:31-14:31; 15:1-16:4a; 16:4b-33; 17:1-26). I more or less follow this, treating 15:1-16:4a and Jesus' final prayer briefly and separately but only because DIQ is either absent (in the prayer) or unrelated to the motif under investigation (cf. 15:20).

¹³ See the influential chapter by Ethelbert Stauffer, "Valedictions and Farewell Speeches," in *New Testament Theology* (London: SCM, 1955), building off of his earlier "Abschiedsreden," *RAC* 1 (1950): 29-35. More recently, see Paul A. Holloway, "Left Behind: Jesus' Consolation of His Disciples in John 13,31-17,26," *ZNW* 96 (2005): 1-34, who like Stube reads the discourse in the context of Greco-Roman literature, including both farewell and death bed speeches. Meanwhile others, for example Johannes Beutler (*Habt keine Angst: Die erste johanneische Abschiedsrede (Joh 14)* [SBS 116; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984], esp. 19, citing texts from Genesis, *Jubilees*, 1 and 2 *Enoch*) and Ashton (*Understanding*, 421), insist on a stronger connection to Jewish testamentary literature.

the same language. Scholars have noted the strong connections between these sections, whether as doublets of a departure discourse tradition or as parallel sections in a larger chiasmic structure.¹⁴ While either may be correct, the development of departure and return language through DIQ suggests also that John presents the language twice in order to shift focus between different issues: first on social distinctions (*who* can see Jesus?), then on temporal distinctions: *when* can Jesus be seen, and how?

Stepping back from these more refined discussions, each of the various genres of testament, farewell, and consolation to which John 14-17 has been linked addresses a singular concern: the real *absence* of the speaker.¹⁵ The Johannine group may argue for, and indeed truly *feel* Jesus' presence in the church, but it is something that *must be argued for* over the course of a significant chunk of the gospel. Furthermore this presence, real as it may be, does not fully mitigate his absence. The people behind the gospel seem to long for Jesus' former presence in earthly life and resurrection appearances, and his future presence in *parousia*. John's genius is in taking elements from the farewell and

¹⁴ For a summary of the parallels between the two passages, see *Brown*, John, 2:589-92. He sees them as duplicates, possibly arranged in a chiasmic structure when the second passage was added to the first (p. 2:594; although with caution, see above chapter 3 n. 42). Marie-Joseph Lagrange (*Évangile selon Saint Jean* [8th ed.; Paris: Gabalda, 1948]) had already argued that the second passage was a less developed, earlier stage of thought, while Fernando F. Segovia (*The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991]) views the second passage as a development of themes in the first. I suspect Lagrange is close to the truth, but it is not a question that concerns us here. For more, as well as a detailed if in some ways idiosyncratic chiasmic reading of the farewell discourse, see Wayne Brouwer, *The Literary Development of John 13-17: A Chiasmic Reading* (SBLDS 182; Atlanta: SBL, 1999), esp. 95-118.

¹⁵ As D. Bruce Woll comments ("The Departure of 'The Way': The First Farewell Discourse in the Gospel of John," *JBL* 99/2 [1980]: 225-39, here 228): "the farewell discourse form as such gives formal expression to a basic distinction in time. The use of the farewell discourse form in contrast to the apocalyptic discourse found in Mark and Matthew, for example, is significant because of the emphasis which is placed, by this very choice, upon the fact of the *departure* of Jesus. The departure enacts a division between past and future... This division, or discontinuity, or separation is not merely a theme found in one 'text' [i.e. John 14:2-3] taken from the tradition." Wendy E.S. North argues that a similar assurance of presence in absence is given through the narrative construction of healing miracle scenes, all of which involve Jesus' absence in John ("'Lord, If You Had Been Here...' (John 11.21): The Absence of Jesus and Strategies of Consolation in the Fourth Gospel," *JSNT* 36/1 [2013]: 39-52).

testament genres which acknowledge Jesus' departures in death and ascension to the Father, and redirecting them toward his presence among believers and, as I will argue, his appearance in visions experienced by an inner circle of his disciples.

Such a mystical understanding of Johannine worship was hypothesized by David E. Aune several decades ago: "the primary characteristic of the Johannine community is precisely that of a prophetic, charismatic or pneumatic community... [and] within the cultic assembly of the Johannine community, the prophetic phenomenon was accompanied by both visions and auditions."¹⁶ Aune points especially to the promise to Nathanael in John 1:51, "Amen, amen I say to you, you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man," as "the kind of event which the Johannine community experienced pneumatically within the context of the community at worship."¹⁷ Such visions would confirm Christ's real presence within the church even if they were not experienced by everyone:

Some of the references to the "seeing" and "coming" of Jesus within these Discourses apparently refer to the cultic vision or epiphany of the exalted Jesus, in which the actual pneumatic experience of a cultic Christophany is clothed in the language and imagery of conventional theophanic and Parousia traditions... [The] final coming of the exalted Jesus was conceived as either a direct visionary experience within the context of worship, or alternately as a presence mediated through prophetic personalities who spoke in the name and with the full authority of their exalted Lord.¹⁸

¹⁶ *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity* (NovTSup 28; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 89.

¹⁷ Aune, *Cultic Setting*, 97. As Aune points out, with respect to visions of Christ or, more specifically, the Son of Man, John is not at all out of character with other early Christian literature, as is evident in the visions of Stephen (Acts 7:55-56), of Paul (Acts 9:1-9; 22:3-11, 17-21; 26:9-19), of John of Patmos (e.g. Rev 1:7, 12), and the promises of such visions in Mark 13:26; 14:62 and pars., which Aune traces to cultic worship "in which the exalted Lord and coming Son of man were the objects of prophetic vision" (p. 94). Meeks ("Man from Heaven") and Grese ("Heavenly Journey") both connect John 3:3 ("unless one is born from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God") to heavenly journey traditions, although the latter reduces these visions to only "the revelation of God that is available in the life and death of Jesus" (p. 693).

¹⁸ Aune, *Cultic Setting*, 15.

Aune does not do away with the final advent of Jesus, but instead traces how *parousia* traditions evident in John 14:2-3 (and 21:22-23) are acknowledged but re-appropriated to the visionary presence of Christ in the church.¹⁹

Jonathan Draper develops the visionary aspects of the Gospel of John further by highlighting how similar the setting of the farewell discourse is to those typically used to induce altered states of consciousness: purification (cp. John 13:4-11),²⁰ the ritual eating of meals, a central visionary surrounded by an inner circle who can vouch for his vision and who can record any prophetic messages that are delivered.²¹ Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce argue for a similar understanding of “Johannine prophetism” (*profetismo giovannista*) over the course of several works.²² Importantly, they focus on the potential hermeneutical role of such practices in interpreting the words of both Scripture and Jesus,

¹⁹ Aune, *Cultic Setting*, 129-33.

²⁰ It is noted in 13:11 (through DIQ) that Judas Iscariot is not pure (καθαρός), and for this reason the “session” cannot begin until the impurity is removed (cp. 13:30); see Jonathan Draper, “The ‘Theatre of Performance’ and ‘The Living Word’ of Jesus in the Farewell Discourse(s) in John’s Gospel,” *JECH* 4/1 (2014): 26-43, here 38.

²¹ See also “Temple, Tabernacle and Mystical Experience in John,” *Neot* 31/2 (1997): 263-88. Draper highlights how important scribes are in such a setting, if sometimes tertiary (the seer receives a vision, delivers it to the inner circle, who deliver it to the scribe), listing Baruch (to Jeremiah and his own visions), Ezra, and Sebnā (to Isaiah, *Asc. Isa.* 1:2-5) (“Theatre,” 32-33). We might add Enoch (“the scribe of righteousness,” *I En.* 12:4; 15:1) and John of Patmos. In John, depending on how we interpret ὁ γράψας (John 21:24), the Beloved Disciple may be thought of as the scribe who records the words of Jesus (whether historical or through christophanic auditions) or as the member of the inner circle who vouchsafes the words and delivers them to a scribe (i.e. causes to be written; cf. John 19:19).

²² Adriana Destro and Mauro Pesce, *Come nasce una religione: Antropologia ed esegesi del Vangelo di Giovanni* (PEL 8; Rome: GLF editori Laterza, 2000), followed by “Il profetismo e la nascita di una religione: Il caso del giovannismo,” in *Carisma profetico, fattore di innovazione religiosa* (ed. G. Filoramo; Brescia: Morcelliana, 2003), 87-106, and “Continuity or Discontinuity between Jesus and Groups of His Followers? Practices of Contact with the Supernatural,” *ASE* 24/2 (2007): 37-58. Michael A. Daise follows up on their work, specifically applying it to John 14:2, although he tends to ignore the communal setting emphasized throughout Destro and Pesce’s works, which has the effect of overemphasizing the individual (“Ritual Transference and Johannine Identity,” *ASE* 27/2 [2010]: 45-51). For example, he is quite close when he says (p. 50), “the interface between the divine and human is relocated from the temple precincts to the believer’s body,” although I might re-phrase, “the believers’ *bodies*” since it is always the unified group of believers to which Jesus comes through the Spirit (i.e. always πρὸς ὑμᾶς, never [in John] πρὸς σε).

a function of the Spirit/Paraclete that is evident throughout the farewell discourse.²³ It is the cultic presence of the Spirit that enables the disciples to remember that Jesus said, for example, “Destroy this sanctuary, and in three days I will raise it up” (2:19), and to infer—only after he was raised from the dead and the disciples received the Spirit—that he was speaking of the sanctuary of his body (2:21-22).

Such prophetic understanding may point to two new functions of DIQ. First, as we have already seen, since new messages received through prophetic means must still be *understood*, DIQ grounds new understanding in well-established language.²⁴ Minimally we can say that as John adds radical reinterpretations of how believers have access to God in the present and in the eschaton, it grounds these reinterpretations in words already ascribed to Jesus and in stock language and images taken from visionary circles. John assumes that these latter ideas are understandable, and uses them to facilitate a new understanding of visions of Christ as nothing short of theophanies,²⁵ and the church (or at least the Johannine group) as the rebuilt earthly temple.²⁶

²³ For a brief catalogue of these aspects of Johannine prophecy, see Destro and Pesce, “Il profetismo,” 104.

²⁴ See Draper, “Theatre,” 33: The message “has to be translated or expressed in terms of what can be said in a particular language and culture: in short it represents the *cultural capital*... which is available to the seer in the contested field to which the prophecy speaks and which is deployed to strategic advantage.”

²⁵ Draper collapses everything in the farewell discourse (and often outside them) to discussions of present visions of Christ through heavenly ascent. That is, Jesus will draw all people to him in heaven (12:32), Jesus will return to draw visionaries up to the heavenly temple (14:1-4), etc. I am far from convinced that John *only* discusses visionary experiences, but Draper's work does highlight how John's language is constructed in a way that allows us to ‘hear’ these resonances in a polyvalent fashion.

²⁶ Draper (and others) takes the motif of Jesus as the eschatological temple, combined with the intimate connection between believers and Christ, to mean that the church also constitutes the eschatological temple. I would agree that Jesus becomes the eschatological temple that will descend from heaven visibly and physically at the eschaton. However, the community of believers becomes the new *earthly* temple, reflective of and intimately connected to the heavenly temple just as it should be, but in need of ongoing purification (3:22-25; 13:10-11) and sanctification (17:17-19), still vulnerable to attack (15:18-16:4; 17:15) and corruption (6:60-66). Coloe comes close to recognizing the similarity between the Father's dwelling in the

Second, in this context DIQ also provides protection against deceptive or defective prophetic messages. The presence of visionary prophetism within the group does not necessitate that *everyone* is granted such visions of Christ.²⁷ It may be a small minority of believers who experience visions. Draper discusses the many safeguards against the abuse of prophecy contained in *Didache* 11:7-12, such as the prophet giving true teaching and practicing it (cp. John 13:17, 34-35; 14:21).²⁸ Among Johannine groups, 1 John 4:1 discusses testing spirits to determine whether they are from God or the product of *false prophets*. One test is the confession of Jesus having come (ἐληλυθότα) in the flesh (1 John 4:2-3). Meanwhile John of Patmos has a vision of unclean spirits emerging from the mouth of a false prophet (Rev 16:13).²⁹

community as he did in the temple, but she seems to see this indwelling as the ultimate consummation of the Father's (or Jesus') presence (so cannot be withdrawn?) and views the idea of a heavenly temple as a useless consolation to the grieving disciples (despite paradoxically noting that the image is used in Christian funeral services two millennia later; see the summary of her position in *Dwelling in the Household of God: Johannine Ecclesiology and Spirituality* [Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007], 107-13).

²⁷ "Of course it is an inner circle of those accepted as true prophets, represented here by the disciples, who are granted the possibility of ascent to the heavenly vision of Jesus enthroned. 'Cosmic mysteries of the assembly/church' [cf. *Did.* 11:11] are hedged around with prohibitions and protections because they are dangerous to the prophet and to the community as well. Ordinary members of the community would not see or hear Jesus except through faith and through the words of the prophet uttered in [altered states of consciousness]. Nevertheless, the community can know that one who has seen Jesus has seen the Father [John 14:9], and that the disciples will do greater works than Jesus because he goes to the Father and whatever they ask in his Name Jesus will do (14:12-14)" (Draper, "Theatre," 38). Draper interprets John 20:29 ("Blessed are those who have not seen, yet believed") as an effort to maintain full inclusion of non-visionary members of the group. If it is correct to infer visionary activity among Johannine Christians, those visions are clearly *contingent on belief* (e.g. 11:40, see below), placing Thomas in a unique position to believe because he has seen. See additionally below on 14:18-22. Destro and Pesce (*Come nasce*, 137-39) argue for rather more universal visionary experiences as the mark of inclusion in the group (John 4:20-24), although this may only indicate initiation to a certain 'rank'.

²⁸ Draper, "Theatre of Performance," 33-34; the protections are based on exegesis of Deuteronomy 18, as are similar prophetic safeguards discussed in *m. Sanh.* 11.5 (*b. Sanh.* 89a).

²⁹ Also 1 John 2:18-25. Compare the testing language regarding false prophets in Matt 7:15-20, while 2 Peter 2:1-3 describes false prophets/teachers as those who deny the master. In John, the works of Jesus are either identical with or closely related to the signs. Just as Jesus issues enigmatic "I am" statements and promises the disciples that they will do greater works than he (John 14:12), in other texts he predicts that false prophets will also declare "I am" and perform signs (cf. Mark 13:6, 22 and pars.; Rev 19:20).

In such a context where believers may have cause to doubt the reports of visions and auditions, especially when they report controversial teachings about Christ, DIQ not only grounds the prophetic messages in traditions linked to the earthly Jesus, it also protects against false teaching. John explicitly and argumentatively works to hold the community grounded in Jesus' words, which must be kept.³⁰ Paraphrastic DIQ expresses the same concern in practical terms: the authority of Jesus' words is acknowledged, and one may only push them as far as their intrinsic polyvalency (hence John's affection for *double-entendre*) or an appropriate paraphrase will allow. Such a prophetic model of DIQ helps to account for the inclusive hermeneutic that we have detected on other grounds: if the 'original' statement is given Jesus' authority (however it is phrased, and more importantly, however it is understood), it is difficult to supersede through paraphrase without undermining his authority, although one might add to its range of meanings within the linguistic bounds established by the group. In only a few cases does John try to limit the interpretation of what Jesus has said.³¹

The literary understanding of DIQ that I have presented so far is not exclusive to an understanding within the context of early Johannine mysticism that I will occasionally advocate for in this chapter, due both to the form and especially to the content of the sayings being elaborated by John. A visionary group can still use the appropriate literary tools to convey meaning through a text. So while the bulk of the analysis will be of a literary nature, tracing how John introduces and reexamines similar themes in new con-

³⁰ See John 8:51; 14:15, 21, 23-24; 15:10, 20; 16:14-15; 17:6. Cp. 10:35, "Scripture cannot be broken."

³¹ In those few cases where John wishes to eliminate an interpretation, it either voices it through Jesus' opponents or portrays it as an inappropriate paraphrase. Notably, the content often has to do with death and absence, whether Jesus' departure (7:35-36; 8:22; 12:34) or the death of believers (8:52; 21:23).

texts, with new audiences, and with modified wording, the visionary hypothesis is meant to enrich our understanding not only of the concerns of the Johannine group, but most likely its cultural and religious context.

Jesus Comes and Jesus Goes, Part I: Outsiders

From here on we will examine how John develops sayings about Jesus' cosmic movements into and out of the world, in some cases using a disjointed three-part interpretive pattern similar to the one discussed by Borgen, but spread out over multiple scenes and addressed to distinct audiences. Under the influence of scriptural sayings about the coming of the Lord, the Messiah, or other figures, some statements about Jesus coming into the world have already been applied to the beginning of his public ministry or to the incarnation.³² In the former category are the variants of the Baptist's statements about the one coming after him (1:15, 27, 30). In the latter category are the particularly Johannine sayings about Jesus as the bread of life that descended from heaven (6:33, 38, 41-42). Yet after chapter 6, John ceases to quote claims about Jesus' cosmic movements *into* the world and instead begins to focus on his various departures *from* the world and returns to it. In fact, the discussion of what it means for Jesus to *go* begins in the dispute at Tabernacles in chapter 7. Here Jesus twice introduces the theme of his departure and it is twice objected to by a hostile audience, but in neither case does Jesus elaborate or clarify his meaning. Instead, he waits until he is alone with the loyal disciples (cf. 13:33) to endorse any interpretations of his message.

³² A fuller list of such statements using ἐρχομαι would include John 1:9, 11 (the Light; also 3:19; 8:14?); 3:2, 31; 6:14 (the Prophet); 7:28 (the Messiah), 42; 9:39 (the Son of Man); 12:47; 13:3; 18:37 (the King).

The declaration about where Jesus goes (7:33-34) does not arrive precisely out of nowhere, but it is quite loosely connected to the material surrounding it. The block of material preceding it deals mainly with Jesus' origins (7:25-31)—where he is *from*, not where he is going. A narrative break intervenes in which we learn that officers have been sent to arrest him (7:32), at which point Jesus makes a bold statement that seems to combine four strands of tradition:³³

John 7:33-34: a) Yet a little time I am with you, b) and I go to the one who sent me. c) You will seek me and you will not find [me], and d) where I am, you cannot come.

Only c) and d) are quoted by the Jews, now or later, but b) influences the development of this material in the next chapter. The first statement (a) will not be developed until Jesus is alone with his disciples. Before tracing this development, the pre-Johannine evidence for the material placed on the lips of Jesus in this scene should be traced.

Yet a Little Time I Am with You (ἔτι χρόνον μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι)

Jesus introduces immediately the temporal and social themes that will dominate this material as it is developed. Two strands of tradition are alluded to by “yet a little time.” The first refers to the shortness of life, as for example Job 24:24, “They are exalted a little while (מעט) and are gone,” or Ps 37:10, “Yet a little while (ועוד מעט) and the

³³ Cp. Ridderbos, *John*, 270 on John 7:33: “These words of Jesus that now follow are clearly intended not as a reaction to vs. 31 but to vs. 32.”

wicked man is no more.”³⁴ The second strand refers to a major and imminent action to be taken by God:³⁵

Isa 10:25: For yet a little while (LXX: ἔτι μικρὸν) and the indignation will end, but my anger will be on their [the Assyrians’] council.

Hag 2:4-7: Act because I am with you (LXX: μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἐγὼ εἰμι), says the Lord Almighty... Yet it is one small moment³⁶ and I will shake the heavens and the earth and the sea and the desert; and I will shake all the nations, so that the treasure of all the nations will come and I will fill this house with glory.³⁷

As it moves from prophetic texts into apocalyptic ones, the note of imminence turns into urgency. The above text from Haggai is adapted into the first century Hebrew apocalypse, *Hazon Gabriel* (24-25), calling for the Jerusalem temple to be divinely rebuilt soon.³⁸ *Second Baruch* uses the phrase in much the same way of Zion.³⁹ In John, Jesus has already compared his death to the destruction of the temple (John 2:19-22), and here he appropriates from the temple the source of living water (7:37-39) and light (8:12) in

³⁴ The LXX of Job 24:24 is quite different from the MT, with no temporal reference, but LXX Ps 36:10 has ἔτι ὀλίγον. The line continues, “you will seek his place (LXX: ζητήσεις τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ), and you will not find (οὐ μὴ εὑρήσεις).” *Second Baruch* uses the phrase to refer proverbially to the shortness of life in general (48:12, “For we are born in a short time, and in a short time we return;” cp. also 16:1; 48:50).

³⁵ In addition, see Isa 29:17 (“Will Lebanon not in a little while [LXX: οὐκέτι μικρὸν] be turned into a fruitful field?”); Jer 51:33 (“Yet a little while [LXX Jer 28:33: ἔτι μικρὸν] and the time of her [Babylon’s] harvest will come”); Hos 1:4 (“Yet a little time [LXX: ἔτι μικρὸν] and I will avenge the blood of Jezreel on the house of Judah”). See also Isa 26:20 [cp. Heb 10:37]; 54:7 [LXX: χρόνον μικρὸν]; Rev 6:11; 20:3).

³⁶ The phrasing here is awkward in the MT, which has עֹד אֶחָת מֵעַתָּה הִיא. When the line is drafted nearly verbatim into *Hazon Gabriel*, it is simplified to עֹד מֵעַתָּה. The LXX has ἔτι ἄπαξ. Whatever the precise sense, “the phrase denotes imminence” (John A. Kessler, “The Shaking of the Nations: An Eschatological View,” *JETS* 30/2 [1987]: 159-66, here 163) even if it was later understood as eschatological.

³⁷ See also the allusion to Hag 2:7 in Rev 21:24.

³⁸ For more detail, see Jeffrey M. Tripp, “A Revelation from Gabriel to Nathan? The Herodian Temple and the Ideology of the Davidic Covenant in the *Hazon Gabriel*,” *ASE* 31/1 (2014): 7-27. *Hazon Gabriel* also anticipates a *sign* (הַאֲוֶרָה) in three days (HG 80), probably tied to the temple; cp. John 2:19-23.

³⁹ See 2 *Bar.* 32:2 (“For after a short time, the building of Zion will be shaken in order that it will be rebuilt”) and 68:5 (“after a short time, Zion will be rebuilt again”).

the Tabernacles ceremony.⁴⁰ If these intertextual clues were heard in the short phrase, then Jesus' audience might expect that his life will be short, but that a divine act is also imminent that will renew the center of worship and punish the unrighteous rulers of Jerusalem. "Imminent," however, should be taken with a grain of salt. If the eschatological predictions of Haggai—yet to be fulfilled a number of centuries later, in the readings of the first century CE—were anticipated "in a little while," then we should not necessarily limit the loose time-stamp to the hours (as in 12:35; 13:33) or months (in 7:33) until the crucifixion. What Jesus points to is a temporal distinction between the situation now and some future circumstance that approaches.

Here the threat is that Jesus will be *with them* only a little time. Given the high christology of the gospel, assertions of Jesus being with believers probably gain added depth from similar assertions of God's presence *with* his people. In the Hebrew Bible, this almost always has the additional sense that God is on Israel's side.⁴¹ Such language continues in the early church, with Paul making stereotyped promises of having God "with you" (cf. 2 Cor 13:11; Phil 4:9).⁴² In Rev 21:3, God's presence is linked directly to the new creation when God "will tabernacle with them" (σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν). Accor-

⁴⁰ Moloney, *John*, 252-53; Barrett, *John*, 328.

⁴¹ For other examples of God/the Lord "with" Israel generally, see Num 23:21; Deut 20:1; Joshua 1:9; Judges 6:12-13; 2 Chron. 13:12; 15:2 ("Yhwh is with you while you are with him, and if you seek him, he will be found by you [LXX: ἐὰν ἐκζητήσητε αὐτόν εὕρεθήσεται ὑμῖν]"); 19:6; Isa 8:10; Zech 8:23; 10:5. All of these cases use μετὰ in the LXX. For more, see Ulrich Wilckens, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 227. Only two people are told that God is *with* them individually: Abraham (Gen 21:22) and David (1 Sam 10:7; 2 Sam 7:3; 1 Chron. 17:2), who are both mentioned at Tabernacles (John 7:42; 8:33, 37, 39-40, 52-53, 56-58). Earlier in John, Nicodemus declares quite confidently (3:2), "No one can do the signs that you do unless God is with him (ἢ ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ)."

⁴² Although stated in the future (ἔσται μεθ' ὑμῶν), Paul's promises seem only conditional on practicing certain virtues; that is, God will be *with* any believer who is at peace or who does what (s)he learned, received, heard, and saw in Paul. John 12:26 builds the co-presence of Jesus and those who believe in him on the condition of behaviors like serving and following Jesus.

ding to John's prologue Jesus "tabernacled among us" (ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν) after he became flesh, an example of John applying imagery to Jesus' earthly life that is elsewhere applied to God's eschatological presence. The conflation of the presence of God and of Jesus is made explicit with Matthew's citation of Isaiah, that Jesus will be called Emmanuel or "God with us" (1:23).⁴³ The notions of taking sides and of presence are understandable in each of these cases, but in John weight shifts dramatically toward presence.⁴⁴

Logia pertaining directly to Jesus' presence with believers are applied both to his earthly life and to his post-resurrection spiritual presence with the church in the Synoptic tradition. Jesus' response to a question about fasting is that his disciples cannot fast for as much time (ὅσον χρόνον) as they have the groom with them (μετ' αὐτῶν) (Mark 2:18-20 and pars.). A future time is implied when Jesus will not be with them,⁴⁵ and John is at least tangentially aware of this tradition (cf. John 3:29). Elsewhere Christ declares in a resurrection appearance, "I am with you (ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι) all the days until the completion of the age" (Matt 28:20), and in a vision to Paul, "I am with you (ἐγὼ εἰμι μετὰ σοῦ), and no one will lay a hand on you to harm you" (Acts 18:10).⁴⁶ In Johannine

⁴³ W.F. Albright and C.S. Mann (*Matthew* [AB 26; Garden City: Doubleday, 1971], 8-9): "The sense is of God's active vindication of his people," a statement often true of the "little while" sayings. The revelation is presented to Joseph by an angel who appears to him in a dream (Matt 1:20).

⁴⁴ Given that the Paraclete is imagined as both *with* (14:16-17, 26; 16:12-15) and *on the side of* (16:7-11) the disciples in their conflicts, the expression may be polyvalent in those cases.

⁴⁵ See Hooker, *Mark*, 99-100. Compare also at his final meal, Luke 22:27 ("I am in the middle of you [ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι] as one who serves"), a line that some have (dubiously) seen as the inspiration for John's footwashing scene (e.g. Lincoln, *John*, 375). Later at a post-resurrection meal the risen Christ refers to the "words I spoke to you while I was with you (ἔτι ὧν σὸν ὑμῖν)" (Luke 24:44).

⁴⁶ The saying in Matt 28:20 forms an inclusio with Matt 1:23, where Jesus is named "God with us." In one of Luke's resurrection appearances, Jesus is asked to "remain with us" (24:29, μεῖνον μεθ' ἡμῶν). He does, and he shares a meal with Eucharistic overtones (24:30-31).

circles, in a revelation shown to John of Patmos, the risen Christ assures the angel of the church of Laodicea that he will enter and eat “with him” (μετ’ αὐτοῦ).⁴⁷

The assertions of Jesus’ post-resurrection presence with believers outside of John often occur in a vision, and most in the context of a meal. When Jesus returns to these themes at the beginning of the farewell discourses *in the context of a meal*, he begins by telling the disciples, “I am with you yet a little while” (13:33, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι), paraphrasing 7:33a. The context of visionary revelation appears after Philip asks that Jesus show them the Father:

John 14:9: “Such a time I am with you (τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι)⁴⁸ and you have not known me, Philip? The one who has seen me has seen the Father. How do you say, ‘Show us the Father’?”

While the referent in both of those cases could easily be the earthly life of Jesus, this is not the case when, after telling the disciples that the Paraclete will be *with them* forever (14:17, ἢ μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), Jesus paraphrases explicitly in terms of vision:

John 14:19: “Yet a little while (ἔτι μικρὸν) and the world no longer (οὐκέτι) sees me, but you see me.”

A time approaches when Jesus is coming to the disciples (14:18) and the Paraclete will be with them (14:16), and when the world *no longer* sees Christ but the disciples do.⁴⁹ The

⁴⁷ There is reciprocity here: Jesus will dine with the angel, and he with Jesus. Earlier in the verse, Jesus says that he “will come in to him” (εἰσελεύσομαι πρὸς αὐτὸν). Jesus’ coming to (πρὸς) believers is reciprocated by their coming to (πρὸς) him (cf. in DIQ, 6:44, 65).

⁴⁸ The same phrase, “I am with you,” is backward looking here (cp. NRSV, “*Have I been* with you all this time”) as opposed to 7:33, where it is forward looking (cp. NRSV, “*I will be* with you a little while longer”). John accomplishes this by modifying the time reference, not the phrase, “I am with you” (as e.g. μεθ’ ὑμῶν ἔσομαι, in Matt 17:17).

⁴⁹ The expansion regarding the Paraclete in 14:17 is important: he is called “the Spirit of Truth whom the world cannot receive because it does not *see* him, nor does it know him. *You* know him because he remains with you (παρ’ ὑμῖν) and will be in/among you (ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται).” It is possible but not necessary that know-

reference here cannot be to the earthly life of Jesus but, at the soonest, to the resurrection appearances.⁵⁰ It probably points well beyond these: John agrees with the Synoptic tradition in applying a prosaic but polyvalent expression to Jesus' earthly life and also to Christ's spiritual presence *with believers* after the resurrection.

I Go to the One who Sent Me (ὕπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με)

"I go" will only be quoted after the scene repeats more or less (8:21-22; and see 14:28), while the Johannine, "to the one who sent me" never is. The Fourth Gospel uses ὕπάγω more than any other text in the NT,⁵¹ but there is perhaps a Synoptic case that is relevant. During his last meal, just before the institution of the Eucharist, Jesus comments on his impending betrayal (Mark 14:21): "Because the Son of Man goes (ὕπάγει), as it is written about him."⁵² Notably, given the paraphrases that will happen in the Jews' response (John 7:35; see also 14:2-3), Luke 22:22 replaces ὕπάγει with πορεύεται.⁵³ *Where* it is written that the Son of Man goes away is unclear, and Mark probably only summarizes the passion predictions. Jesus obliquely reveals an awareness of his own death using

ledge of the Paraclete implies also visions of him, in parallel with the world's inability to do either (cp. the Baptist's vision of the Spirit in 1:32-33).

⁵⁰ Keener (*John*, 2:973), who assigns most of the "coming" language to the resurrection appearances, is overly strong: "the coming *must* refer to his coming in 20:19-23 to impart the Spirit to them" (emphasis added). The intratextual links to 20:1-23 argue that the final gospel has this appearance in view, if perhaps not exclusively so (see below). Jean Zumstein ("Jesus' Resurrection in the Farewell Discourses," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John* [WUNT 222; ed. R. Bieringer and C.R. Koester; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008], 103-26, here 108-9) lists scholars who agree with Keener (n. 12) or who point instead to the *parousia* (n. 13), but concludes that "one cannot exclude the possibility that the implied author plays with a certain ambiguity to increase the potential meaning of the text."

⁵¹ Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:150 n. 47. All 15 cases of the first person form, ὕπάγω, appear in John.

⁵² Compare the intrusion of an awkward historical present (ὕπάγει) in John 13:3 (Jesus... goes to the Father), just after a note about Judas' betrayal (13:2) and just before Jesus' last meal.

⁵³ Cp. also Luke 13:31-33. Luke 22:22 uniquely replaces, "just as it is written about him" with, "according to what has been determined" (κατὰ τὸ ὁρισμένον). Could Luke not find where it was written?

this verb in Mark, but such a use of ὑπάγω is not common and contributes to the opacity of Jesus' prediction.⁵⁴ John likewise uses the ambiguity (inaptness?) of the verb to its advantage: "these words [a little longer, and then I go]... are intentionally vague; Jesus has foreknowledge of coming events, but to speak more precisely would obscure the deeper meaning of them."⁵⁵ A social distinction is highlighted: Jesus is with them now, but soon he is going to be with others.

You Will Seek Me and You Will not Find [Me] (ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσετέ [με])

Although above (chapter 3) I argued that this and other similar phrases tap into Greco-Roman judicial language, there is little question that they tap into Jewish prophetic, sapiential, and apocalyptic motifs as well. The challenge is actually in narrowing down which of them might be in view.⁵⁶ A frequently cited text is LXX Prov 1:28-29, spoken by Wisdom: "The wicked will seek me (ζητήσουσίν με) and they will not find (καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσουσιν), for they hated wisdom."⁵⁷ Given that John portrays Jesus very much like Wisdom in the prologue, the Proverbs passage is a viable pre-text. But there are others:⁵⁸ the bread of life discourse precedes the scenes at Tabernacles, in which Jesus

⁵⁴ See Hooker, *Mark*, 336-37: "The verb to go (ὑπάγω) is taken up by the fourth evangelist and used of Jesus going to the Father (e.g. John 7.33; 8.14; 16.5) but is not normally used in the sense of 'to die'." In Mark, Jesus does not clearly signal *who* the betrayer will be (a problem Matt 26:25 addresses but that Luke 22:23 highlights), *when* he will be betrayed, or even (here) that *it will lead to his death*.

⁵⁵ Lindars, *John*, 295.

⁵⁶ The intertextual links are present whether the real authors intended them or not. It is perhaps more accurate to say that we, as readers, are in search of the pre-text that gives the richest reading.

⁵⁷ For example, Bultmann, *John*, 307 n. 2; Keener, *John*, 1:720 n. 168; Cory, "Wisdom's Rescue," 101. Such a reading is strengthened by Wisdom motifs in John 7:37-38 (cp. Prov 9:4-5; Sir 51:23-24), and strengthens LXX Prov 24:9 ("a fool dies in sins" [ἀποθνήσκει ἐν ἁμαρτίαις]) as a pre-text for the paraphrase in John 8:21 (Cory, "Wisdom's Rescue," 110 n. 28).

⁵⁸ Klaus Berger has collected a number of these texts, many of which pre-date the Fourth Gospel (*Die Griechische Daniel-Diegesse: Eine altkirchliche Apokalypse* [Leiden: Brill, 1976], 76-79), e.g. 4Q185 1-2 I

establishes that he is “true food” (ἀληθὴς βρῶσις, 6:55; see also 6:27), making LXX Lam 1:19 relevant: “My priests and my elders failed in the city, because they sought food (ἐζήτησαν βρῶσιν) so they might reorient their lives, and they did not find (καὶ οὐχ εὑρον).”⁵⁹ Either of these pre-texts helps to characterize the hostile Jerusalemites as unwise, sinners, evil ones.

The same seeking-and-not-finding motif appears in apocalyptic writings.⁶⁰ The Enochic *Book of Similitudes* records the following passage in a vision of the Son of Man:

1 En. 63:5-8: They will say, “Would that someone had given us a chance to glorify, praise and have faith before his glory! Now *we desire a little rest but do not find it*; we pursue it, but do not procure it. Light has vanished from before us and darkness has become our habitation forever because we have formerly neither had faith nor glorified the name of the Lord of the spirits and kings, nor glorified the Lord in all his creation. We had put our hopes in the scepters of our empires. On the day of our hardship and our tribulation he is not saving us, and we have no chance to believe.”⁶¹

I have presented the text in full to highlight not only its criticism of the rulers who possess the land (cf. *1 En.* 63:1), but also the Johannine themes of light and darkness,

11-13 and Ezek 22:30. Keener (*John*, 1:720 n. 168) adds several thematically relevant texts (e.g. Isa 55:6; Ezek 7:25-26). More on point are Hosea 5:6 (“they will go to seek [ἐκζητῆσαι] the Lord and will not find him”) and Amos 8:12 (“they will run around seeking the word of the Lord, and they will not find”).

⁵⁹ Compare John 6:26: “You seek me (ζητεῖτέ με) not because you saw signs, but because you ate from the loaves and were satisfied.”

⁶⁰ Fourth Ezra 5:10 still applies it to Wisdom, while Rev 9:6 uses it to describe the effects of the torture that comes with the fifth trumpet: “people will seek death and they will not find it.” With variant language, Luke 17:22 is more reflective of apocalyptic usage: “Days will come when you will desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, but you will not see.” The Synoptic tradition also features the more positive logion, “Seek and you will find” (Luke 11:9; Matt 7:7), which Lindars views as the source of John’s logion (*John*, 296). There is no contradiction: Prov 1:28 sits within the same document as Prov 8:17, “Those who seek me will find.” The difference is in who seeks Wisdom, and how they go about it.

⁶¹ Translation modified from E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983), 1:5-89, here 1:44. Text suggested by T. Korteweg, “‘You Will Seek Me and You Will not Find Me’ (Jn 7,34): An Apocalyptic Pattern in Johannine Theology,” in *L’Apocalypse johannique et l’Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (BETL 53; ed. J. Lambrecht; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980), 349-54. As can be seen from the examples in Luke and *1 Enoch*, desiring can stand in for seeking in some texts (see Berger, *Daniel-Diegeese*, 77).

glorification and belief. The image of the exalted Son of Man appears soon after the repetition of the seeking motif in the next chapter of John (cf. John 8:21-22, 28).⁶²

Over time and genres, the phrase is consistently used to criticize the seekers as unwise, sinful, or proud. Often they are leaders of God's people. Theodore Korteweg understands John's invocation in its apocalyptic context, where it more strongly carries the urgent warning that a time approaches when it will be *too late* to repent. There is, however, disagreement over when it becomes "too late." A problematic but unfortunately common reading is that the Jews will not find Jesus because he will soon be dead, as even Brown suggests: "These attempts on his life lead Jesus in vss. 33-34 to think of his return by death and resurrection to his Father... [which] will take away from his hearers their opportunity to believe in him."⁶³ Nowhere else in his commentary does Brown argue that belief is uniquely available (to the Jews only?) during the earthly lifetime of Jesus and unavailable thereafter. It is quite the opposite, as John 20:31 ("these things are written so that you may believe") and the argumentative flow of the gospel indicate.⁶⁴ Indeed the flow of the three quoted moments in which this seeking occurs, argues against this precise interpretation. To indulge in a bit of paraphrase:

⁶² Korteweg, "Apocalyptic Pattern," 353.

⁶³ Brown, *John*, 1:318; see also Barrett, *John*, 324-35; Ridderbos, *John*, 271; Lincoln, *John*, 252; Keener, *John*, 1:720. F.F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 180; Korteweg, "Apocalyptic Pattern," 353: "In the same way in St. John's Gospel is it *emphasized time and again* that the short period of Jesus' earthly ministry is in fact the last opportunity of salvation" (emphasis added). The only text he cites in support is John 12:35.

⁶⁴ After the implied passing of the Beloved Disciple, the audience of the gospel is perhaps exclusively comprised of people who never met Jesus, most of whom were probably not born during Jesus' earthly life. To suggest that salvation is uniquely available during Jesus' earthly life would be self-defeating for almost all of the people passing on these traditions. If the issue is their initial, negative reaction to Jesus, then such a reading would be notably anti-Pauline, although nobody advocating this position seems to make the connection. However, the reading is very unlikely to be correct and so would be weak support for Johannine anti-Paulinism.

Jesus: You will seek me and you will not find me.

The Jews: Is it because of your physical absence (7:35-36)?

Jesus: No, this is a misunderstanding.⁶⁵ You will seek me and will die in your sin.

The Jews: Is it because you will be dead (8:22)?

Jesus (to the disciples): No, this too is a misunderstanding.⁶⁶ You will seek me, and where I am going you cannot follow now, but you will follow later.

Neither Jesus' death nor his physical absence is presented as an insurmountable obstacle to finding Jesus, believing in him, or coming to him. The temporal distinction is pushed too far by isolating the passage from the rest of John. To the extent that Jesus' death is in view, Moloney is probably closer to the truth in seeing the accusation as particular: not all people or even all Jews, but *these chief priests and Pharisees* who send officers to arrest him and seek *to kill* him, will fail to find salvation.⁶⁷

If the claim, understood apocalyptically, must be generalized beyond Jesus' story world audience, then we might focus on the vision of the Son of Man. Barrett embraces the apocalyptic language, so that Jesus is 'locatable' until the final judgment, and only then does it become "too late."⁶⁸ In John 7:34, this makes the most sense: those who react negatively to the Son of Man as revealed on the cross may seek a 'Son of Man', but they will not find him. They will die in their sin because they fail to believe, a belief that is

⁶⁵ As will become clear later, Jesus is wherever his disciples are (12:26; 14:3; 17:24). See above on "I am with you" and below on "where I am."

⁶⁶ As is also made explicit, Jesus continues to live (6:51, 57-58; 11:25; 14:19).

⁶⁷ Moloney, *John*, 270. Bultmann (*John*, 307) initially seems to have a similar view to Moloney ("It is not Jesus whom they will destroy, when they remove him, but *themselves*"—emphasis original), but then he goes too far: "Then 'they will seek him', they will long for the revelation, but in vain; for then it will be too late; he will no longer be accessible to them." Why? Can they not receive revelation through Christ's disciples like any new believer does? "Too late" becomes a refrain for the next several pages in Bultmann's commentary. Nevertheless he later argues that "precisely in the community's Spirit-inspired proclamation of the word he himself [i.e. Jesus] is at work as Revealer" (*John*, 618).

⁶⁸ Barrett, *John*, 325: "there would be a time (the final judgement rather than a time of national necessity is meant) when, too late, they would seek his aid." Barrett seems to be arguing against a view like that advocated by Haenchen (*John*, 2:16): "They will seek Jesus and not find him—viz., during the distress of war and the destruction of Jerusalem."

really only possible *after* the cross and the only means of access to the Son of Man until his final, eschatological arrival.⁶⁹

Where I Am, You Cannot Come (ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν)

Finally Jesus tells them that where he is, they cannot come.⁷⁰ Brown hears echoes of the divine ἐγὼ εἰμὶ (here inverted) and approvingly cites Augustine (*In Io.* 31.9): “Christ was ever in that place to which he would return.”⁷¹ The question of Christ’s location—where Christ is, has been, is going—is one that the Fourth Gospel obsesses over. The first question that his disciples ask him is, “Where do you abide?” (John 1:38).⁷² In fact, later in the gospel Jesus will repeatedly claim that believers are or should be “where I am.”⁷³ There is a distinct chance that John has constructed this statement as a variant of “you cannot come to me” in a Johannine idiom.

Yet John is not the only early Christian text concerned with where Christ is, as can be seen in Colossians:

⁶⁹ *Gos. Thom.* 38, addressed to the disciples by the risen Jesus, at first glance would seem to support the “too late” interpretation, if moving it a bit later to his ascension: “On many occasions you have wanted to hear these sayings that I am saying unto you. And you have no one else to hear them from [no Paraclete?]. Days will come when you will seek me, and you will not find me.” However the following logia seem to explain why this is: the Pharisees and the scribes (i.e. the Twelve? the Church?) have chosen not to enter and will not allow anyone else to enter, whereas *Thomas* envisions the true object of seeking not the Jesus who is outside (cp. *Gos. Thom.* 40) but the divine inside (cp. *Gos. Thom.* 2; 24; 94).

⁷⁰ On the sapiential background of this and other elements here, see Theobald, *Herrenworte*, 424-55.

⁷¹ Brown, *John*, 1:314. Consider the emendation to John 3:13 in the Latin tradition (“no one has ascended into heaven except the one who descended from heaven, the Son of Man *who is in heaven*”), which Augustine follows (cf. *In Io.* 12.8).

⁷² In narrative context we might translate, “Where are you staying (ποῦ μένεις)?” Yet the question takes on a deeper resonance in John. Other questions about Jesus in John include, “Where is he?” (7:11; 9:12; cf. 11:57), and “Where are you going?” (13:36; cf. 14:5, although see 16:5). See also John 3:8, 8:14; 14:4.

⁷³ Cf. John 12:26; 14:3; and 17:24. All four instances use the same word order (ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ), which may argue for a formalized phrasing in John’s tradition, but at the very least argues against *variatio* for *variatio*’s sake in the Fourth Gospel. Keener (*John*, 2:872 n. 65) suggests also that John wishes to “avoid introducing christological connotations [in the use of ‘I am’]... where they are not an issue.”

Col 3:1: If you were raised together with Christ, seek (ζητεῖτε) the things above (τὰ ἄνω), where (οὗ) Christ is sitting at the right hand of God.⁷⁴

Matthew meanwhile places Christ more down to earth:

Matt 18:20: “For where (οὗ) there are two or three gathered together in my name, there I am in the middle of them.”

The adverb here differs from John’s (ὅπου), but we can find it in other early writings.

Ignatius of Antioch, whom tradition connects to the Apostle John,⁷⁵ gives two proverbial sayings on this theme:

Smyr. 8: Wherever Christ Jesus may be, there is the universal church (ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία).

Phil. 2: Where the shepherd is, follow there like sheep.

The *Gospel of Thomas* also picks up the question of where the risen Christ is:

Gosp. Thom. 24: His disciples said, “Show us the place where you are, for we must seek it.”

Gosp. Thom. 30: Jesus said, “Where there are three divine beings, they are divine. Where there are two or one, I am with him.”⁷⁶

Ignatius or *Thomas* may have been influenced by the Fourth Gospel, or at least by Johannine tradition. Even so John is not the only writer to consider where Christ is in the present. Matthew, Ignatius, and *Gospel of Thomas* emphasize Christ’s immanence, while Colossians emphasizes his distance, even transcendence. John draws two lines of development with this saying, the first through lexical similarity and the second through para-

⁷⁴ The passage continues (Col 3:2-4): Consider the things above, not the things on the earth... When Christ, your life, is manifested (φανερωθῇ), then you will also be manifested (φανερωθήσεσθε) with him in glory.

⁷⁵ See Eusebius, *Hist. Ecc.* 3.22-23.

⁷⁶ Modified from Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures*, 386 in favor of the reading in *P. Oxy.* 1, which has ΕΓΩ ΕΙΜΙ ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤ[ΟΥ]. The Greek saying continues (cp. Coptic *Thom.* 77), “Take up the stone, and *there you will find me*; split the wood, and *I am there*.”

phrase and quotation. The first emphasizes, like Matthew's Jesus, that where he is so also are believers (John 12:26; 14:3; 17:24). The second emphasizes, like Colossians, that Jesus is with the one who sent him. The pair of lines comes together in two paraphrases of quoted material (cp. 13:33 and 14:2 with 13:36 and 14:3): "Where I am going you cannot follow now, but you will follow later... And if I go to prepare a place for you, I am coming again and will receive you to myself so that where I am, you may also be." John draws Jesus closer to the community of believers in the present by emphasizing Christ's immanence, but prepares the audience to be with Christ in his transcendence.

The Jews provide the second step of the elaborative process, the objection, and it reflects Jesus' wording beyond the accurate quotation (as far as it goes), as the introductory questions attest:

John 7:35: "*Where* (ποῦ) does he intend to *go* (πορεύεσθαι) that we *will not find* (οὐχ εὐρήσομεν) him? He does not intend to *go* (πορεύεσθαι) to the diaspora of the Greeks and to teach the Greeks, does he?"

The misunderstanding is geographical and social: they cannot go where Jesus does because that would put them among impure Greeks, Jewish or otherwise.⁷⁷ Scholars have rightly detected irony in this objection since Jesus' word will be carried into the diaspora through his followers, whom he is with (μετά) and among (έν). Socially, Jesus will consort with Greeks (signaled in 12:20). There is another sense in which the separation between Jesus and the hostile Jerusalemites will be insurmountable: Jesus will be with the Father. By barring themselves from movement *toward* Jesus (at the time of Jesus' earthly life) and subsequently *into* the company of Greeks (in the time of the audience),

⁷⁷ There are no other reasons I can think of why Jerusalemites *cannot come* to the diaspora if they want in order to learn from Jesus.

the Jerusalemites bar themselves from movement *toward* heaven and *into* the company of God (both in the time of the audience and on the last day).

There is no direct elaboration, interpretation, or clarification of what Jesus meant in the immediate context. The three-part interpretive pattern is interrupted. Instead a narrative break intervenes, fast-forwarding the action from the middle of the festival (cf. 7:14) to “the last day, the great one” (7:37).⁷⁸ John 7:37-39 fails to clarify the little time that Jesus is with them, what it means for him to go to the one who sent him, why they will be unable to find him or, in a clear manner, why they cannot come where he is.⁷⁹ All four statements emphasize Jesus’ absence, but polyvalently so that either his death or his ascension could be in view. These topics drop out of focus until Jesus paraphrastically returns to them in the next chapter.

Another narrative break intrudes (8:20) prior to Jesus picking up the topic of his departure again (8:21): “I am going (ὑπάγω), and you will seek me and you will die in your sin. Where I am going (ὑπάγω) you cannot come.” It is a toss-up whether we should view this modified saying as Jesus taking up the matter a second time, or as a disjointed paraphrastic interpretation of the first saying. The first subtraction of the Johannine, “to

⁷⁸ The temporal note, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἑσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς, can point to the seventh day of Tabernacles (more likely given the water imagery in 7:37-38), or to the eighth added day of rest (*m. Sukk.* 5:6; see Moloney, *John*, 232-37). “The great day” is unattested elsewhere and so fails to clarify. “On the last day” has an apocalyptic ring to it (cf. John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 11:24; 12:48), tapping into eschatological dimensions of the Feast of Tabernacles, and it is perhaps this echo that was more important to John than a precise temporal marker. Remo Cacitti (*Grande Sabato: Il contesto pasquale quartodecimano nella formazione della teologia del martirio* [Studia Patristica Medolanensia 19; Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1994]) traces the patristic disputes over this verse and its conflations with John 19:31, which border on allowing a re-punctuation of the verse: “On the last, great day of the feast,” Jesus stood up and cried out, saying, “if anyone should thirst, let him come to me and drink.”

⁷⁹ It is only much later at John 16:7 that the going away is tied explicitly to the advent of the Spirit. It might be argued, since Jesus invites anyone who thirsts to come to him (7:37) that the Jews do not thirst, but then it is not immediately clear how thirsting is distinguished from seeking Jesus.

the one who sent me,” is perhaps implied by synecdoche. “You will not find me” has been replaced to help explain *why* they will not find him: because they will die in their sin.⁸⁰ Jesus also seems to accommodate the Jerusalemites’ earlier focus on where he will *go* by substituting ὑπάγω for εἰμί.

There is perhaps also a temporal aspect to this substitution: where 8:21-22 seems to point to the future (i.e. Jesus’ death), 7:33-36 may point to the unbridgeable distance between Jesus and his audience in the present.⁸¹ Brankaer sees the one (“where I am”) as atemporal or eternal, and the other (“where I go”) as temporally embedded in the story. She may be right, but it is also possible that John has presented two versions of the logion linking the story time (in which Jesus has yet to *go to* the Father) and the audience’s time (in which Jesus *is with* the Father already).⁸²

Jesus says he is going away. Someone familiar with the Son of Man logion in Mark 14:21 may conclude that this involves his death (as the Jews do here), especially since the second “lifted up” Son of Man saying (John 8:28) might help his or her recollection. One note of irony in the second objection of the Jews, that they wonder if Jesus will kill himself when they seek to kill him (and will momentarily attempt to stone him), works in its immediate context. A second note of irony, that Jesus will not kill himself

⁸⁰ On this point, compare *Gos. Thom.* 59: “Consider the one who is alive while you are alive, lest you die and then seek to behold that one—and you will not be able to behold.” It is not clear, however, that John thinks the Jews can seek Jesus after death, physical or otherwise.

⁸¹ Brankaer, “Citations internes,” 140, drawing the model from Jean-Marie Sévrin, “La fin et le temps dans l’Évangile selon Jean,” *Revue d’Éthique et de Théologie Morale (Supplement)* 207 (1998): 101-24.

⁸² The Fourth Gospel has already made a similar move with the Baptist: in the story world, this *is* the one who is coming (1:30); from the post-resurrection perspective of the prologue, this *was* the one (1:15). John will continue this tendency in the farewell discourses.

but he will lay down his life for believers, only works with the addition of John 10.⁸³

Similarly, the irony of the first objection, that Jesus will teach in the diaspora through his disciples, only works if he is in some way present among his believers, in some way *with* them in a way that he is not with the Jerusalemites after the “little time” has passed. Such an understanding of Jesus’ presence will only become clear in the farewell discourse when Jesus takes up the same themes for a third time.⁸⁴

Jesus Comes and Jesus Goes, Part II: Insiders

Jesus does not return to his departure until his audience is restricted to the disciples.⁸⁵ In fact, he waits until even Judas has left the group (cf. 13:30), a significant narrative break. After a saying about the Son of Man (that carries its own temporal tensions),⁸⁶ Jesus launches into the topic of the discourses by quoting himself, recalling the previous declarations of his departure:

⁸³ The intratextual connections to the shepherd discourse are subtle but viable given that the later discourse occurs at the same festival. They are strengthened when Jesus quotes what he said in 8:21 to the loyal disciples at 13:33 and Peter declares that he will *lay his life down* for Jesus.

⁸⁴ Certain lexical echoes of the present material appear at the conclusion of the first half of the gospel (at 12:26, “where I am,” and 12:35-36, “yet a little time the Light is with you”) and in the mini-prologue to second half (13:1-3, Jesus knows “he goes”). Each tends to focus the material more on Jesus’ death, especially 13:1-3, but this tendency is hidden from the secondary characters through metaphorical language, or in the last case as an assertion from the narrator directly to the gospel audience. The focus on death will continue into the beginning of the farewell discourse and Jesus’ dialogue with Peter.

⁸⁵ Applying Borgen’s three-part interpretive model in an expanded sense, a similar move is made at two other points in John. In 1:19-34, the Baptist confesses, “I am not the Christ” and two of his disciples leave to follow Jesus (1:35-37); later his remaining disciples voice an objection drawing in language from the earlier passage (3:25-26) and the Baptist responds by paraphrasing and quoting what he said before (3:27-30). In 6:43-45, a block of material lexically and thematically unrelated to the objection of the Jews (6:41-42) appears and just as quickly disappears so that Jesus can actually address their objection (6:46-51). The objection to 6:43-45 does not appear until it is voiced by the disciples in 6:60, and Jesus responds by paraphrastically quoting in 6:65 what he said in 6:44.

⁸⁶ John 13:31-32 is a crux passage in the tension between now and not yet: the Son of Man *was* glorified (ἐδόξασθη) yet God *will* glorify (δοξάσει) him. The general opinion is that the passage refers exclusively to Jesus’ passion (e.g. Keener, *John*, 2:922), but Barrett argues for two events (*John*, 450-51): νῦν the Son of Man is glorified in death, but soon (εὐθὺς) he will be glorified in “the gift of the Spirit, and his abiding

John 13:33: “Little children, *I am with you yet a little while. You will seek me,* and just as I said to the Jews, ‘*Where I go you cannot come,*’ I now also say to you.”

The quotation is from 8:21, but the introductory language from 7:33.⁸⁷ Jesus quite precisely draws attention to the two moments of the speech acts: he *said* it to *them then* with an exclusive sense; he *says* it to *the disciples now* with an inclusive one. Both the temporal and social distinctions are important.

An objection soon follows, only here the three-part pattern is given room to be completed, allowing Jesus to elaborate on what he has said.⁸⁸ Peter picks up Jesus’ language with the simple question, “Where are you going?” (ποῦ ὑπάγεις;). This becomes one of the defining themes of the farewell discourse, paraphrased by Thomas in 14:5 (“we do not know where you are going [ποῦ ὑπάγεις]”) and invoked negatively by Jesus:

John 16:5: “Now I go (ὑπάγω) to the one who sent me, and none of you asks me, ‘Where are you going?’ (ποῦ ὑπάγεις;).”

This verse is notoriously problematic, but here it is enough to point out that the question of *where Jesus is going* was apparently important enough to reappear three times on the

presence with his own.” Frey rejects the hypothesis that John has adapted an early Johannine apocalyptic hymn (*Eschatologie*, 3:285), although the “hymn” may only reflect the temporal perspective of the post-resurrection church: the Son of Man is glorified *now* (through death and resurrection), and God will glorify him *immediately* (through the Spirit and in *parousia*, which is always near).

⁸⁷ Johannes Beutler (“Synoptic Jesus Tradition in the Johannine Farewell Discourse,” in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition* [R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher, eds.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001], 165-73, here 168) claims that the triple repetition of this motif echoes the Markan passion predictions (complete with an objection from Peter), but the match is not as close as with the “lifted up” sayings.

⁸⁸ Catherine Laufer (“The Farewell Discourse in John’s Gospel as a Commentary on the Seder Service,” *Colloquium* 27/2 [1995]: 147-60), argues that Jesus is questioned by four named disciples in the first section of the discourse (Peter, Thomas, Philip, and Judas, all “children” according to 13:33) in imitation of “the four sons” who ask questions at the Seder. The fit is not perfect, but it is notable that the second question deals with apparent contradictions in Scripture (cp. Thomas in John 14:5, resolving an apparent contradiction in Jesus’ words), and the last often deals with the coming of the Messiah (cp. Judas’ question regarding Jesus’ future manifestation in 14:22). It is more certain that John uses the questions to interpret, clarify, and expand on controversial points in Jesus’ teaching as it does elsewhere.

lips of three different speakers. Jesus responds by paraphrasing (13:36): “*Where I am going* (ὅπου ὑπάγω) *it is not possible to follow now, but you will follow later.*” Jesus does not answer Peter’s question—they still do not know *where* he is going, only that they will one day be able to join Jesus there (when exactly?).⁸⁹ Socially something about the disciples is different from the hostile Jews at Tabernacles, who simply cannot come where he goes, and temporally something is different about now and later.

It will be eight chapters before John clarifies that Peter will follow Jesus in violent death (21:18-19), although an informed audience might already pick up on the allusion.⁹⁰ Awareness of traditions in Revelation would strengthen such a reading. In an eschatological vision of the Lamb (Rev 14:1; cp. John 1:29, 36), those who have not defiled themselves with women “follow (ἀκολουθοῦντες) the Lamb wherever he goes (ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ).” These 144,000 appear earlier, their robes whitened in the blood of the Lamb who is their shepherd (Rev 7:14, 17). The 144,000 are probably the same as the souls (ψυχὰς) of those slaughtered because of God’s word and their testimony (Rev 6:9), i.e. martyrs.⁹¹ In his objection in John, Peter offers to lay down his life (ψυχὴν) for Jesus, who as the good shepherd lays *his* life down for his sheep. The wealth of intertextual

⁸⁹ Mark Jennings (“The Fourth Gospel’s Reversal of Mark in John 13,31-14,3,” *Biblica* 94/2 [2013]: 210-36, here 219) points out that Jesus does, in part, answer the question with his self-citation at 14:2 (“I go to prepare a place”). The “reversal” of Mark that Jennings describes is more one of emphasis than of argument, vocabulary, or even of literary structure, but his article highlights some of the eschatological motifs in John 13:31-14:3 and the similarities in Mark’s and John’s ideologies.

⁹⁰ *Acts of Peter* 35 (late second century?) does, portraying Peter as attempting to leave Rome before being martyred. He passes (the risen) Jesus walking into Rome and asks, “Lord, where are you going?” Jesus responds, “I go to Rome to be crucified.” Note the paraphrastic DIQ: “And Peter came to himself, having seen the Lord ascending into heaven. Then he returned to Rome, rejoicing, and glorifying the Lord, because he said, ‘*I am being crucified again,*’ which was about to happen to Peter” (translation and discussion in Paul Foster, “Peter in Noncanonical Traditions,” in *Peter in Early Christianity* [ed. H.K. Bond and L. Hurtado; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015], 222-62, here 242).

⁹¹ Lupieri, *Apocalypse*, 151-52.

links between John and Revelation at this point strengthens the case not only for John's development of traditional material, but also for the interpretation that Jesus means that he is *going* in death, and that Peter will *follow* in a similar death later.

Remarkably Peter presses Jesus again with a second objection, this time responding to Jesus' paraphrase and correctly inferring that death is in view:

John 13:37: "Lord, why *can't I follow you now?* I will lay down my life for you."

It is not clear whether Peter's substitution of ἄρτι for Jesus' νῦν is significant, although it does help to recall Jesus' earlier warning that Peter does not understand what Jesus is doing *now* (ἄρτι), but will understand later (13:7). That line referred to the footwashing, but John uses the footwashing in part as a symbol of the crucifixion—a symbol clarified by the present exchange.⁹²

Jesus responds by picking up Peter's language and clarifying why Peter will not lay down his life for Jesus *now*, just as he said:

John 13:38: "*Will you lay down your life for me?*"⁹³ Amen, amen I say to you, the cock will not crow until you deny me three times."

Notice that Jesus does not deny the relevance of death to a proper interpretation of his words, only that Peter might precede him. The focus has shifted almost entirely to temporal issues: Jesus must die before anyone may follow him. This may betray a need on

⁹² See, for example, Boismard, "Le lavement des pieds (Jn 13:1-17)," *RB* 71/1 (1964): 5-24 and Brown, *John*, 2:566-68.

⁹³ Jesus follows Peter's word order precisely:

Peter: τὴν ψυχὴν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω.

Jesus: τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις;

Again *variatio* for *variatio*'s sake is absent in terms of both vocabulary and word order, and we might take Jesus' statement as an unmarked, indirect quotation of Peter.

John's part to emphasize the importance of Jesus' death, or at least the application of this material to it.

Jesus re-complicates the matter with another citation that adds to the departure language. Jesus begins by encouraging the disciples not to be troubled and to believe in him as they do in God (14:1).⁹⁴ Then he explains *why* they should not be troubled:

John 14:2-4: "In my Father's house there are many dwelling places. If not, would I have told you, '*I go* (πορεύομαι) to prepare a place for you'? And if *I go* (πορευθῶ) and I prepare a place for you, I am coming again and I will receive you to myself so that *where I am* (ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ) you may also be. And *where I go* (ὅπου ὑπάγω) you know the way."

Jesus (re-)introduces a topic and then interprets his earlier statement through paraphrase.

The greatest problem is that John has never reported Jesus as saying anything like, "I go to prepare a place for you." Scholars who are uncomfortable with this sort of unverifiable quotation placed so prominently in the farewell discourse either seize on textual and linguistic difficulties in the verse to eliminate the quotation altogether,⁹⁵ or seek out previous lines of the gospel to fill the gap.⁹⁶ It is simpler to accept that John has Jesus cite a

⁹⁴ The addendum to not let their heart be terrified (μηδὲ δειλιάτω) in 14:27 recalls many angelic visions, especially in the contemporary 4 Ezra 10:55, after Ezra's vision of the heavenly Jerusalem: "Therefore do not be afraid, and *do not let your heart be terrified*; but go in and see the splendor and vastness of the building." But see also LXX Deut 1:28-29 for a testamentary if earthly example.

⁹⁵ Eliminating ὅτι on text-critical grounds, see Brown, *John*, 2:619-20 (against this, see the Appendix); accepting ὅτι but reading it as causal because they are explicitly disturbed by the unverifiable quotation, see Barrett, *John*, 457; Fischer, *Wohnungen*, 35-36; Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:57-58; Ridderbos, *John*, 489 n. 25; Moloney, *John*, 397. James McCaffrey, (*The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14,2-3* [Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1988], 138-40) takes a less extreme view, accepting both the ὅτι and the citation, but reading it as indirect ("would I have told you *that* I go to prepare a place for you?") because Jesus has not said this explicitly in John.

⁹⁶ Bultmann, *John*, 601 n. 4 says that it recalls 12:26 indirectly (and 17:24, since his reconstruction displaces much of John's text). Noack is even more tentative (*Tradition*, 148: "wenn auch kaum als tatsächliche 'Vorlage'"). Schnackenburg (*John*, 3:59) argues for 13:33, 36, but this would go well beyond John's other paraphrases. The relevance to John 8:35 is sometimes noted (e.g. Barrett, *John*, 456) and Scholtissek goes so far as to read John 14 as a *réécriture* of John 8:12-59 (*In Ihm sein und bleiben: Die Sprache der Immanenz in den Johanneischen Schriften* [HBS 21; New York: Herder, 2000], 241-44),

speech act that the gospel has never narrated, as it does elsewhere (cf. 1:33-34; 3:28; 6:36; 11:40).

In the Appendix, I give textual and syntactic arguments for the above translation, but even accepting these does not solve all the problems presented by John 14:2-3.⁹⁷

There are various ways to understand what Jesus means by “my Father’s house” (the earthly temple,⁹⁸ the heavenly temple,⁹⁹ heaven generally¹⁰⁰), what the many “dwelling

although he acknowledges that 14:2 does not *cite* 8:35 (because it is an unverifiable quotation like 11:40). Since μὴνῇ is related to a favorite Johannine verb, μένω, the phrasing of 8:35 in a larger discussion of what it means to be Jesus’ disciple is broadly relevant: “The slave does not remain in the house forever (οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα); the son does remain forever (ὁ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα).”

⁹⁷ That Fischer devotes his entire dissertation (*Wohnungen*) to just 14:2-3, often without resolving the issues he examines despite a thorough survey of ancient and modern literature, underlines the difficulty of this brief passage.

⁹⁸ For an immediate comparison, see John 2:16 (τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου; cf. 2:17). That John is referring to the earthly temple is the position taken by McCaffrey (*House*, with the disciples originally the new priesthood), in part supported by a conflation of John 14:2 with Luke 2:49 in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 5.36.2: ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μόνος εἶναι πολλάς (noted in S. Légasse, “Le retour du Christ d’après l’évangile de Jean, chapitre 14 et 16: Une adaptation du motif de la Parousie,” *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 81 [1980]: 161-74, here 163-64). Légasse, however, does not take this position. Steven M. Bryan (“The Eschatological Temple in John 14,” *BBR* 15/2 [2005]: 187-98) critiques McCaffrey but only in that he argues that, while the earthly and heavenly temples are in view, John anticipates a dissolution of the barrier between earth and heaven (esp. p. 198). Bryan’s model has much to commend it, especially the focus on inclusion in the earthly temple rather than limited entry into the priesthood. Keener (*John*, 2:932) hears a double-entendre, agreeing with Augustine (*Tr. Ev. Io.* 68.2.1) that Jesus prepares Christians to become God’s temple (I would add, *earthly* temple) in language allowing future eschatology.

⁹⁹ Bryan (“Eschatological Temple,” 189-90) draws attention to 2 Macc. 2:17-18, where Israel is gathered into “his holy place,” and the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 En. 90:28-29), where the sheep are all drawn into the eschatological temple. See also Segovia, *Farewell*, 83 n. 46, and I would include arguments like Kerr’s (*Temple*, 293-99) and Robert H. Gundry’s (“In My Father’s House Are Many *Monai* (John 14:2), *ZNW* 58 [1967]: 68-72), that “my Father’s house” refers to Christ due to Jesus’ assimilation of the temple (so Kerr although he argues also that “house” is symbolic of “family”) and to the notion of remaining in Christ (so Gundry).

¹⁰⁰ David E. Holwerda, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John: A Critique of Rudolf Bultmann’s Present Eschatology* (Kampen: Kok, 1959), 20 n. 52; Brown, *John*, 2:625 and Barrett, *John*, 456-47 (in line with Philo); W. Robert Cook, “Eschatology in John’s Gospel,” *Criswell Theological Review* 3 (1988): 79-99, here 97, citing images of God enthroned in heaven (e.g. Ps 33:13-14).

places” might refer to (resting places for souls after death¹⁰¹ or in the eschaton¹⁰²), or whether preparing a place for the disciples is primarily a play on motifs related to the exodus¹⁰³ or to the Davidic temple.¹⁰⁴ Depending on how we answer those questions, our

¹⁰¹ Luke’s “eternal tents” (τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς, 16:9) are sometimes invoked in support of this interpretation, although it is not clear that they necessarily should. Philo describes a descent-ascent schema for the soul (back to its “heavenly place” [οὐράνιον τόπον], *De Somn.* 1.181) that really only applies to Christ in the Fourth Gospel, but he does so while commenting on God’s promise to Jacob, “I will bring you back to this land” (Gen 28:15)—a tradition that evidently interested John (John 1:51). Cp. also LXX Gen 28:15 (“I am with you,” ἐγὼ μετὰ σοῦ). The model of receiving heavenly dwelling places at death was the most popular patristic understanding (see Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3.19.3; 5.36.2 citing John [see also 2.34.1]; Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 4.6; 6.14; 7.14; Origen, *Princ.* 2.11.6; Jerome, *Ag. Jov.* 2.28). Brown (*John*, 2:619) notes that Irenaeus credits the transmission of the saying to the elders, not to John, possibly indicating that the saying was at one point variably attributed. However as Frey rightly recognizes (*Eschatologie*, 3:139-40), while John may hint at the dualistic model of one set of dwelling places for the righteous and another for the wicked (as in *1 Enoch*), there is no indication that the *quality* of the dwelling places will vary according to the believer’s worth, as it appears in the patristic interpretations. *Gos. Truth* 42.37-43.8 is similar to Origen in broad strokes but perhaps closer in this regard to John: “This is the place of the blessed; this is their place... it is not fitting for me, having come to be in the resting place, to speak of anything else.” Fischer (*Wohnungen*, 236-40) and Frey (*Eschatologie*, 3:140-41) trace the development of these motifs in Gnostic (e.g. *Gos. Truth* 40.30-41.14; *Apocr. James* 2.19-34; *Left Ginza* 442.28ff.) and rabbinic literature. The Gnostic literature, including *Gos. Thom.* 24a (His disciples said, “Show us the place where you are, for we must seek it,” which Frey correctly views as a Gnosticized reinterpretation of John 14:1-8), is later than John and in some ways a development of John 14. Much of the rabbinic material is Talmudic (7th century) or later. The repeated appearance of these motifs in Gnostic and rabbinic circles attests to their popularity among apocalyptic groups.

¹⁰² See below n. 106 for references in the Enochic *Similitudes*. Jerome rejects the supposition ascribed to Jovinian, that the dwelling places are churches scattered throughout the world (*Ag. Jov.* 2.28, a very realized interpretation), as “laughable” not due to the timing but to the earthly location (see previous note).

¹⁰³ Bryan (“Eschatological Temple,” 195) draws attention to the song of Miriam in LXX Exod 15:17, where the Lord is asked to bring Israel in “to the mountain of your inheritance, to your prepared habitation (εἰς ἔτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου)... a sanctuary, Lord, that your hands prepared (ἡτοίμασαν αἱ χεῖρές σου).” Brown, *John*, 2:625, noting that the speech takes place the night before Passover, supports this reading by appeal to Deut 1:29 and 1:33 (the Lord “goes before you on the way [LXX: προπορεύεται πρότερος ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ] to choose a place [τόπον] for you, guiding [ὁδηγῶν] you by fire at night and a cloud by day, showing you the way by which you should go [δεικνύων ὑμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν καθ’ ἣν πορεύεσθε]). These declarations appear at the beginning of what is essentially a long farewell speech from Moses. Robert A. Bascom (“Preparing the Way: Midrash in the Bible,” in *Issues in Bible Translation* [UBSMS 3; ed. P.C. Stine; London: UBS, 1988], 221-47) traces the development of the exodus tradition through Isaiah and Malachi into John in several stages, from an exodus from Babylon that includes the return of the Lord to the rebuilt temple (Isaiah 40; 57 and 62), to the (eschatological) return of the Lord in judgment (Malachi 3:1-5, 23). Bascom argues that John picks up on these traditions, presenting Jesus as leading a new exodus into the heavenly temple.

¹⁰⁴ Scholtissek, *In Ihm sein*, 246-47. In support of this reference, Ashton (*Understanding*, 424) points to David’s testament to his son, Solomon in 3 Kingdoms 2:1-9 and the intertextual echoes it has to the farewell discourse (note the DIQ): “I am about to go the way (ἐγὼ εἰμι πορεύομαι ἐν ὁδῷ) of all earth. Guard

understanding of when and how Jesus returns to receive believers varies widely. Space does not permit us to explore these details fully, but I will point out that each question allows a (final) eschatological interpretation. The elements of John's argument that force a realized eschatological interpretation follow after the present passage.¹⁰⁵ Realized eschatology is a *development* of John 14:2-3 that must be argued for over the course of the entire chapter. John assumes his audience's familiarity with the teaching about Jesus going to prepare a place and returning to receive the disciples as an apocalyptic and eschatological reality, a teaching that is no more refuted than the Baptist's testimony that he was foretold about the Spirit descending onto Jesus is. Now John must draw in a more challenging understanding of these sayings. With what we have seen already of how John develops material reintroduced by a quotation, often in an inclusive manner that builds on the previous understanding rather than replacing it, there is little reason to doubt that John supports both a final eschatological understanding of Jesus' teaching and a realized one, without collapsing the one into the other.

the charge of the Lord your God, going on his ways (πορεύεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ) and guarding his commandments (φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ)... so that the Lord might establish his word which he spoke, saying, 'If your sons guard their way (τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν) to go before me in truth (πορεύεσθαι ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ) with their whole heart and their whole soul,' saying, 'there will not fail you a man on (ἐπάνωθεν) the throne of Israel.' The quotation seems to mix elements evident in the *Shema* (Deut 6:5), Ps 132(131):11-12, and the Davidic covenant scene in 3 Kingdoms 7, the last pointing heavily to the importance of the Jerusalem temple.

¹⁰⁵ Compare Ridderbos' comment on Becker: "He admits that vss. 2 and 3 can only be understood as referring to the parousia... and speak of Christ's exaltation and communion with his disciples in the same sense as 'the early Christian tradition in 1 Co. 16:22ff.; 1 Th. 1:9, etc.' But the Fourth Evangelist used an older apocalyptic revelatory saying that he 'explains and decisively reinterprets in what follows (vss. 4ff., 18ff.)' ... All these forced understandings of vss. 2 and 3 are based on the view (repeatedly combated in this commentary) that because of the 'presence' statements in John there is no room for a still to be expected 'coming' of Jesus that has dimensions of glory that are not or cannot be manifested in this earthly dispensation" (*John*, 491).

It is unclear whether the claim about the Father's house has already been connected to the quoted phrase that follows, or if Jesus only juxtaposes the two.¹⁰⁶ The Enochic *Similitudes* record visions of dwelling places for the righteous, holy, and elect.¹⁰⁷ The righteous may dwell in these abodes immediately after death or in the eschaton, but the latter is a strong option: in the vision the Righteous One is already revealed and drives sinners from the face of the earth (*I Enoch* 38). We cannot be sure that the *Similitudes* provide a direct background for John's image, but if so they point to two things: a still future fulfillment, but one perceptible through visions.

Jesus comforts his disciples about his departure with a traditional but social and eschatological image of the righteous together in the household of God.¹⁰⁸ He supports it with a quotation, in which the "place" that he goes to prepare is probably connected with the house with many rooms (14:2b). The introduction, "Otherwise would I have told you..." is unusual but points forcefully to its testimonial nature: Jesus is *on record* as telling the disciples that he goes to prepare a place for them. That is not to say that in the

¹⁰⁶ A few verses earlier Jesus said, "you will seek me" before quoting himself as saying, "where I go, you cannot come" (13:33). This recalls 8:21-22, where the two statements appeared together.

¹⁰⁷ Among the verses often cited: *I En.* 39:4 (There [at the ends of the heavens] I saw other *dwelling places of the holy ones*; cp. 41:2); 45:3 (On that day... *their resting places will be without number*, their souls will be firm within them when they *see my Elect One* [cp. John 1:34], those who have appealed to *my glorious name* [cp. John 14:13-14; 15:16; 16:23-26; 17:6, 11-12, 26]); 60:8 (east of the Garden of Eden, in which the elect and the righteous ones dwell [the righteous dwelling in the garden also becomes a motif in rabbinic texts]); 70:3 (But he [the Son of Man] placed me between two winds... where the angels took a cord to measure for me *the place for the elect and righteous ones*); and 71:6 (Everyone... *will follow your path* [cp. John 14:4-6], since righteousness never forsakes you. *Together with you will be their dwelling places*, and together with you will be their *portion* [cp. John 13:8]). Outside of the *Similitudes*, see *I En.* 108:13: "[God] will give faith—as well as *the paths of truth* [cp. John 14:4-6]—to the faithful ones in the resting place." Translations from Isaac, "1 Enoch." Compare also *2 En.* 61:2: "*Many shelters have been prepared for people*, good ones for the good, but bad ones for the bad, many, without number." Udo Schnelle (*Das Evangelium nach Johannes* [THNT 4; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1988], 228) gives additional references, including *Apoc. Abr.* 17:16; 29:15.

¹⁰⁸ On this, see van der Watt, "Eschatology in John," and Nozomi Miura, "'My Father's House' (*Familia Dei*): A Network of 'Family' Metaphors in the Fourth Gospel," *AJBI* 39 (2013): 21-63, esp. 49-54.

presumed past Jesus used the saying to make this exact point, i.e. to comfort his disciples by assuring them a place in the Father's household in light of his own death and departure.¹⁰⁹ Within the story world, the point is only that the disciples can confirm that he has said it as he reapplies the saying to a new context. The rhetorical force of quoting it for the real world audience is stronger if they are familiar with it, which has led some scholars to conclude that it was well-known among John's initial audience.¹¹⁰

Even if the message is familiar to the audience or to the disciples, John may still paraphrase here.¹¹¹ The use of *πορεύομαι* over the more favored *ὑπάγω* perhaps may argue that it is borrowed from a source,¹¹² as might the relatively precise conditional repetition that introduces the interpretation:

πορεύομαι ἐτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν·
καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἐτοιμάσω τόπον ὑμῖν...¹¹³

¹⁰⁹ "The Merkabah mystical experience of an ascent to heaven is described as a heavenly journey of Jesus' disciples with him to go to the Father's οἰκία at the end-time. However, this experience is the outcome of the prior descent-ascent of Jesus" (Jey J. Kanagaraj, *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background* [JSNTSup 158; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998], 312). It is not clear that the "place" has already been identified with the Father's household; it may be a novel connection of this passage (cp. 8:35).

¹¹⁰ E.g. Becker, "Abschiedsreden," 222-23; Weidemann, "Eschatology as Liturgy," 291.

¹¹¹ Although he does not address the possibility of paraphrase, Moloney (*John*, 398) comments: "while an end-time eschatology is dominant... there is already a hint of the presence of the absent one." It would be in keeping with John's other citations to anticipate this development and to modify the wording of the citation accordingly.

¹¹² With regard to *πορεύομαι*, Matthew uses it 30 times, Luke 51, and Acts 37. Mark (prior to the longer ending) never uses it, and John uses it only 13 times. With *ὑπάγω*, Matthew uses it 19 times, Mark 15, Luke five, and Acts never. John uses *ὑπάγω* 33 times. According to LSJ, *ὑπάγω* has the sense of "go away," but it can also mean "to lead," "to draw on by a pretended flight," and "to bring before a court," all of which may be active resonances in John. *1 Clem.* 5.7 refers to Paul's death by saying that he "was brought (ἐπορεύθη) to the holy place (τὸν ἅγιον τόπον)." Rev 12:6 similarly builds on exodus imagery of preparation: "And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she has a place there prepared (ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον ἡτοιμασμένον) by God."

¹¹³ Compare the somewhat similar conditional construction in 8:24 that Jesus previously used to build an interpretation on, except with the repetition in the apodosis.

Since we do not have the original of 14:2b, we cannot be sure to what extent John paraphrases the saying, although the closer John can keep it to the original, the harder it is to question the interpretation. So far John has applied departure language to Jesus' death and to his ascension using two separate quotes.

If he is going and preparing a place for them, Jesus continues, then he is coming again (πάλιν ἔρχομαι) and *will* receive (παραλήμψομαι) them to himself.¹¹⁴ For the first time, Jesus speaks of a return. The expansion poses problems to those who interpret Jesus' departure uniformly as death: his return from death might reasonably point to his resurrection, but then in what way does he receive them to himself?¹¹⁵ He leaves again in ascent to the Father, and his current absence is felt by someone or the farewell discourse would not need to be written. Others try to relate the image neatly and already to the spiritual presence of Christ in the church, but this is problematic as well.¹¹⁶ First, such an interpretation needs at least the rest of the first farewell discourse to be developed; it is not at all obvious yet. Second, John builds upon eschatological language using a phrasing

¹¹⁴ Becker ("Abschiedsreden," 222) highlights lexical similarities with Matt 24:36-44 (cp. Luke 17:34-40): "Thus will be the *parousia* of the Son of Man. There will be two in the field: one is taken (παραλαμβάνεται), the other is left; two grinding at the mill: one is taken (παραλαμβάνεται), and one is left. Therefore watch, because you do not know on what day your Lord comes (ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται)." In John, we might expect a future form of ἔρχομαι to match παραλήμψομαι (cp. ἐλευσόμεθα, 14:23), but "again" suggests a time distinct from the first (whether incarnation, public ministry, or the time of "I go") and, "In confident assertions... a vivid realistic present may be used for the future" (BDF, cited in Cook, "Eschatology in John's Gospel," 98; see also Frey, *Eschatologie*, 2:124-26). I would add that the specific form, ἔρχομαι, is necessary to acknowledge and to reinterpret established eschatological language about the final coming of the Lord/Son of Man, whereas "we will come" does not have this resonance and so may freely be made future.

¹¹⁵ Cp. Brown, *John*, 2:625: "The saying... would not have been reported if the promise were not thought to have been realized or to be realizable. Yet it is not apparent that Jesus ever did return [at the resurrection] *to take his disciples along with him*" (emphasis original). However, Brown's attempt to dismiss a final eschatological interpretation on the grounds that the end of time was evidently not imminent (2,000 years later) is not terribly convincing.

¹¹⁶ For example, Gundry, "In My Father's House."

that, as we have seen, points to Christ's apocalyptic advent in another Johannine text (Rev 2:16; 3:11; 16:15; 22:7, 12, 20) to serve an image that is recognizable from much earlier Pauline apocalypticism:

1 Thess. 4:13-18: I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, concerning those who have fallen asleep, so that you may not grieve (λυπήσθε; cp. John 16:6, 20-22) like the rest, those who do not have hope. For if we believe (cp. John 14:1, 29; 16:27, 30-31) that Jesus died and rose, so also through Jesus God will bring (ἄξει; cp. John 11:15-16; 14:31) with him those who fell asleep. For we say this to you by the word of the Lord, that we the living who remain until the arrival (παρουσίαν) will not precede those who have fallen asleep. Because the Lord himself, with a command by the voice of an archangel and with God's trumpet, will descend from heaven, and the dead in Christ will rise first (cp. John 5:25, 28; 11:43). Then we the living who remain will be caught up together with them in clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so always we will be with the Lord (σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα; cp. John 14:3, 16). Therefore comfort (παρακαλεῖτε) one another with these words.¹¹⁷

Paul not only describes a scenario in which Jesus is absent after the resurrection but returns to meet believers—dead and alive—to be with him forever. Paul also marks the image as an inherited tradition (“the word of the Lord”) and encourages his audience to pass it on.¹¹⁸ The match is not perfect: Paul may imagine believers welcoming a ruler who then joins them on earth, whereas John's tradition seems to imagine believers fleeing the world. However, over the course of the chapter John moves its understanding of the tradition closer to Paul's, reimagining the scenario so that Christ does return to a con-

¹¹⁷ This passage is often referenced by modern scholars (see Frey, *Eschatologie*, 3:138-45), and for an earlier example see Eusebius, *Comm. Isa.* 8 (on Isa 24:1-3; PG 24 col. 271): “There are many mansions with the Father (*multae sunt mansiones apud Patrem*; cp. Vulg. John 14:2: *in domo Patris mei mansiones multae sunt*) according to the quality of merits; it is said how the saints are swept away on clouds to meet the Lord in the air (*in nubibus obviam Domino in aera*; cp. Vulg. 1 Thess. 4:17), and they will be with him forever.”

¹¹⁸ Notably given the positions being argued here, the traditionalist interpretation of Paul's “word of the Lord” has waned in favor of viewing it as an “oracle originating with Paul himself” (Harm W. Hollander, “The Words of Jesus from Oral Traditions to Written Record in Paul and Q,” *NovT* 42/4 [2000]: 340-57, here 346 n. 15).

quered world to be with his believers, at least in Spirit.¹¹⁹ The present, earthly indwelling reflects and foreshadows the future, heavenly indwelling.

The temporal issues may be difficult to parse out because they are not John's focus. The passage highlights sequence (first departure, then return), not timing. Instead its focus is on the people whom Jesus' actions benefit: believers. This social concern is highlighted by the wealth of pronouns: "I told *you*, 'I go to prepare a place *for you*'. And if I go and I will prepare a place *for you*, I come again and will receive *you to myself*, so that where *I* am, *you* may also be." Jesus is not working out a timeline, but assuring believers of their special status as beneficiaries of these promises.

Over the course of chapter 14, the balance of meaning for the Father's house tilts toward the Father's *household*, where the Spirit comes to dwell as the agent, and so towards the presence of the Son and the Father (see esp. 14:23).¹²⁰ Jesus begins by reminding them of the heavenly temple, which provides the model for the earthly temple that he builds in the church and which houses the divine on earth: the Spirit, and through the Spirit, Jesus, and through Jesus, the Father:

Jesus' words in 14:2-3, isolated from their context, are ambiguous enough to lend themselves to either an eschatological or an immediate postresurrection interpretation. Thus it is hardly surprising that the Johannine context proceeds to qualify the meaning of the promise for John's audience.¹²¹

¹¹⁹ Cf. John 14:30; 16:33 and 1 John 2:13-14; 4:4; 5:4-5; and throughout Revelation, esp. 17:14.

¹²⁰ As Culpepper explains ("Realized Eschatology in the Experience of the Johannine Community," in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John* [WUNT 222; ed. R. Bieringer and C.R. Koester; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008], 253-76, here 267-68): "The latter verse [14:23] clearly refers not to heaven but to the present communion of believers with Jesus through the Spirit. This recasting of the promise in John 14:2-3 shifts the believer's hope from the eternal future to the present, from traditional future eschatology to John's realized eschatology, without denying the future coming of Jesus."

¹²¹ Keener, *John*, 2:938. Compare his earlier summary (p. 2:932): "John may consciously reapply the language of future eschatology to emphasize the eschatological presence of Jesus... future eschatology might provide a model for John's realized eschatology, which in turn provided a foretaste for his com-

But it will take some time to get to that way of understanding his teaching, at least the rest of chapter 14—not a small amount of text.

There is a hint that the Johannine logion in 14:2 may not derive from shared tradition with other Christ-following groups, but from visionary practices within the Johannine group.¹²² Visions of a heavenly temple, described as a great house with many rooms, already appear in Enochic and other pre-Johannine literature.¹²³ Draper argues that Jesus, the only one who has ascended to heaven, comes again and receives the still living disciples into heaven where they have visions of the Father's house, visions else-

munity's future expectations." Keener is quite right that the context and development of the passage in John 14 determine a realized interpretation, but to read the present passage as exclusively realized is to ignore that it is a citation of previous teaching whose context was probably very different, probably eschatological, hence the need for the development in John 14 in the first place. Furthermore, he fails to differentiate between the present experiences of the church and the resurrection appearances. John, meanwhile, spends more time on resurrection appearances than any of the Synoptic gospels, partly crafted to impart special authority to the Beloved Disciple (cf. esp. John 21:24) and to an extent to critique Thomas and Peter (even if the role of the latter is recognized). It is doubtful that the authors would have gone to such lengths to assert how special the resurrection appearances were, or crafted an even longer farewell discourse to console the gospel's audience, if it perceived Christ as present in the same way as the disciples did at those moments.

¹²² Draper ("Theatre," 37; see above n. 25) would see a hint of visionary teachings throughout Jesus' departure language, including 13:36 where the saying, "where I am going you cannot follow now, but you will follow later" could indicate that heavenly visions will be open to the disciples after Jesus dies and gives the Spirit. It does not seem to be how the gospel develops the material within the scene (13:37-38) or with the addition of John 21. As Draper notes, April DeConick goes to the other extreme and sees a reference to the eschaton in 13:33, 36 meant to combat "ascent mysticism" (*Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature* [JSNTSup 157; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004], 109-132). While their disagreement highlights the ambiguity of John's language, the scene in question does not point toward the eschaton, and in fact it seems that an additional citation is needed in 14:2 to move the discourse toward the topic of the end times. We may see a partial confirmation of Draper's hypothesis in the reception of John in *Acts of Andrew* 20, where the apostle John is portrayed as reaching down to help Peter to the top of a mountain in order to receive a vision.

¹²³ See above n. 106 on the Enochic literature, as well as 4QFlorilegium, 11QT 44:3-16 (the *Temple Scroll*), and 4Q403 1.41-46 (*Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*). Although the "house" motif seems to indicate Israel, *Hazon Gabriel* 25-26, 67 also contains an apocalyptic vision of God's glory and a chariot (המרכבה), followed by assertions that he sent (שלחתי) his people prophets, shepherds, and a word (דבר) to "the place" (המקום) (HG 70-72). The image becomes quite common in *Merkabah* and *Hekhalot* texts of the rabbis (e.g. see *b. Hagigah* 12b; *3 Enoch*; and *Hekh. Rabb.* 122).

where described in terms of God's glory.¹²⁴ Such a reading may be supported within the context of other unverifiable quotations in John, the first pair given by the Baptist:

John 1:33-34: "And I did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize in water, *that one told me*, 'On whomever *you see* the Spirit descending and remaining on him, he is the one who baptizes in Holy Spirit.' *And I have seen* and I have testified, 'This is the Son of God'."

The Baptist has a divine audition promising a vision of Christ enabled by the Spirit. He has the vision and is able to share its christological insight with others. Elsewhere Jesus has already criticized Martha for limiting the hope for her brother to the last day (cf. 11:24-27)¹²⁵ when he tells her (11:40): "Did I not tell you, 'If you believe, *you will see* God's glory'?" The quoted statement is almost programmatic for John's understanding of seeing the divine, whether we understand it as referring to cultic visions or the understanding of Christ available through the Spirit after the crucifixion.¹²⁶ One unverifiable quotation reframes a traditional scene as a visionary experience, and another promises some sort of vision contingent on belief.

¹²⁴ "Temple," 280.

¹²⁵ Margaret Pamment ("Eschatology and the Fourth Gospel," *JSNT* 15 [1982]: 81-85, here 84) qualifies Schnackenburg's entirely negative view of Martha by focusing on how her confession ("I know he will rise in the resurrection on the last day") is merely limited: "Jesus' claim: 'I am the resurrection and the life' (11:25) is interpreted through two gnomic statements: 'He who believes in me, though he die yet shall he live', and 'whoever lives and believes in me shall never die' (11:25-26). The first statement interprets the word 'resurrection' and means that whoever believes in Jesus and dies a normal physical death will be resurrected. The second statement interprets 'life' and explains that the life which comes from God and enlivens men's present existence makes physical death irrelevant. Here we have a double perspective."

¹²⁶ At first glance the unverifiable quotation in 6:36 ("But I have told you, 'You have both seen and do not believe'") would seem to complicate the argument. The seeing most often presupposed is either of Jesus, physically in the flesh or of the sign of the multiplication of the loaves (esp. 6:26 for those scholars uncomfortable with unverifiable quotations). However, among the crowd are disciples who will soon defect, perhaps representing those among the group who have claimed to have visions but have now deviated from the ideology of the authors. "You have seen but you do not believe" may carry the implication that they no longer believe, or that they have never truly seen.

The message in 14:2 is grounded in traditional language of heavenly temples and prepared places, deriving from images in Deuteronomy and the prophets that are later applied to visionary scenarios in apocalyptic texts. The *context* of the message is one of visionary experiences guided by the Spirit, where the prophet or seer glimpses the heavenly temple and relays a message to the group in understandable language through traditional tropes: Jesus has gone to the Father's house to prepare a place for you. Yet the *content* of the message is directed, not exclusively to prophets in the group but to everyone, and so must have a more general application: Jesus prepares the heavenly temple for you, and will one day return to take you—all of you—to it.

Thomas takes on round two, picking up on Jesus' language to voice his objection (14:5) that they do not even know where Jesus is going—how can they know the way?¹²⁷ Jesus responds by claiming to *be* the way, exclusively so (14:6). Only by following the path here and now will the believer have access to the Father in the eschaton. As Jesus continues, the exclusivity becomes the focus: knowing him becomes the condition for the possibility of knowing the Father (14:7).¹²⁸ In fact (14:7b), “From now on you do know him and *have seen* (ἐώρακατε) him.” It is tempting to jump ahead and conclude that John

¹²⁷ As happened with Peter, where the disciple's actions portrayed him negatively but the content of Jesus' teaching (“you will follow later”) differentiated him from the hostile Jews, Jesus' interpretation of the teaching in 14:2 provides another point of contrast with the Jews by reversing earlier criticisms of them in the same order that they appeared at Tabernacles:

Where I am, you cannot come (7:34) Where I am, you may also be (14:3)

Where I am going, you cannot come (8:21) Where I am going, you know the way (14:4)

Nonetheless, Thomas objects to the last of these, betraying his lack of understanding.

¹²⁸ It is dangerous to put too much stock in the tenses of the verbs in 14:7a. The NA²⁸ reads: “If you knew (ἐγνώκατε) me, you will also know (γνώσεσθε) him.” This wording connects nicely with discipleship sayings in 8:28 (“you will know that I am”) and 8:31-32 (“you will know the truth”). In the first case a number of mss beginning with A read ἐγνώκειτε (if you *had known* me), while in the second case we find in many of the same mss ἐγνώκειτε ἂν or ἂν ᾗδειτε (you *would have known*), turning it into a reproach of Thomas (see Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:67-68). What is important for us is that Jesus links knowing the Father to knowing him, whatever the rhetorical force of his statement.

so identifies Jesus with the Father that seeing one is equivalent to seeing the other. This is true, but it will not be developed for a few verses yet. Instead, John has previously argued that *no one* has seen God (except Jesus, cf. 1:18; 6:46) and that the Jews have never seen the Father because they do not believe in the one God sent (cf. 5:37-38).¹²⁹ The former would seem to be a polemic against other supposed visionaries, such as Moses or Enoch, claiming the privilege exclusively for Jesus.¹³⁰ The latter allows the possibility that the disciples, who have heard and seen Jesus (God's εἶδος? cf. 5:37), who have God's word (i.e. Jesus) remaining in them (cf. 15:4-5, 7), and who *do* believe in the one who God sent (cf. 17:8), may also see the Father.

Two things are important to note here. First, although John will develop the point away from the notion of a direct theophany of the Father, it has not done so yet. Even if Jesus' assertion that the disciples *have seen* the Father is discordant with the preceding narrative, and it is unclear as of yet why this is only true "from now,"¹³¹ the same language elsewhere points to genuine visionary experiences of heavenly realities.¹³² Philip is

¹²⁹ In 6:46, Jesus says, "Not that anyone has seen the Father except the one who is from God, he has seen the Father." Only on the presumption that someone else is from God would they have seen the Father. Moreover, one might suppose that such direct visions were possible after the gift of the Spirit. However the prologue says that *no one has seen God ever* (οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε) and only that Jesus has *explained* (ἐξηγήσατο) him (1:18). Since the prologue shares the same post-resurrection perspective as the readers, this would seem to eliminate them as well.

¹³⁰ Cp. also 3:13. On Moses, see Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 296-301. On Enoch, see Benjamin E. Reynolds, "Apocalypticism in the Gospel of John's Written Revelation of Heavenly Things," *EC* 4/1 (2013): 64-95, here 76 (n. 58).

¹³¹ Most likely it refers to the impending crucifixion, where Jesus' true divine nature (his glory) can finally be seen.

¹³² Cf. already John 1:34; 3:32; 6:46; 8:38; but also 9:37; 20:18, 25, 29. Elsewhere in the Johannine literature, see 1 John 1:1-3 (Jesus); 3:6 (probably Jesus); 4:20 (God); 3 John 11 (God).

not terribly off base to question how they have seen the Father.¹³³ Second, visionary experiences should not be ruled out altogether. Jesus makes knowing him a *pre-condition* to knowing the Father, and, as the scene develops, identifies seeing him with seeing the Father. Jesus may have a live audience of people who see him in the flesh, but limiting the teaching to that specific narrative setting would be useless to most if not all of the gospel's audience who never knew Jesus in the flesh (i.e. οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες). It also contradicts 1 John which seems to describe members of the group as those who have in some way *seen* Jesus. While I agree with the literature that understands visionary language as metaphorical,¹³⁴ meant in part to ground current teachings in the experience of those who knew Jesus (especially the Beloved Disciple),¹³⁵ we may still take statements like this as an indication of shared cultic, visionary experiences in which the risen Christ is seen by members of the group.

¹³³ Korteweg ("The Reality of the Invisible: Some Remarks on St John XIV 8 and Greek Philosophic Tradition," in *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* [EPROER 78; ed. M.J. Vermaseren; Leiden: Brill, 1979], 50-102) rightly places the exchange between Jesus and Philip within ongoing discussions of the absolute invisibility of God, although it is difficult for me to hear Philip's request as skeptical of the Father's *existence*, as, for example, in Xenophon's *Mem. Soc.* 4.3, "it is enough (ἐξαρκῇ) for you, seeing their works, to revere and honor the gods," or Theophilus of Antioch's *Apology to Autolycus* 2.1, "Show (δείξον) me your God!" Rather, Philip is on the other extreme, presuming that direct visions of the Father are possible without mediation.

¹³⁴ For example, Shannon-Elizabeth Farrell ("Seeing the Father (Jn 6:46, 14:9) Part III: Eschatological Seeing and Memorial Seeing," *Science et Esprit* 4/3 [1992]: 307-29) understands the references to visions using the perfect tense of ὁράω as referring only to the visibility of the witness: just as one may see the Father by seeing Jesus who proclaims him, one may see Jesus by seeing the witness who proclaims him (including the Paraclete?). This is a worthy insight, but does not seem to exhaust the sense of John's sight language.

¹³⁵ Dorothy Lee ("The Gospel of John and the Five Senses," *JBL* 129/1 [2010]: 115-27) views nearly all "sight" language as simply a metaphor for discipleship (see p. 118 in reference to the Greeks who wish to *see* Jesus [θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν], John 12:21). Destro and Pesce ("Continuity or Discontinuity," 52-53) take a more nuanced view that allows visionary experiences alongside social relationships and hermeneutical technique.

Philip responds by asking for a traditionally understood theophany when he requests of Jesus, “Lord, show us (δεῖξον ἡμῖν) the Father and it is enough for us.” The use of δείκνυμι points to revelatory experiences, evident elsewhere for example in Revelation:¹³⁶

Rev 1:1-2: The revelation (ἀποκάλυψις) of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, in order to show (δεῖξαι) his servants the things that must happen soon, and which he signified by sending through his angel to his servant, John, who testified to the word of God and to the testimony of Jesus Christ, the things that he saw (εἶδεν).

Philip likely requests a direct, heavenly theophany of the Father. Jesus does not seem to offer this sort of revelatory experience ‘on tap’ (if at all), but the request forces him to clarify how he can apply such apocalyptic language to the experiences that he promises:

John 14:9: “Such a time I am with you and *you have not known me*, Philip? *The one who has seen me has seen the Father*. How do you say, ‘Show us the Father’?”

Seeing Jesus is not just *a* means of seeing the Father; Jesus may suggest that it is the *only* means of seeing the invisible God.¹³⁷ This is the only time that Jesus quotes someone else by asking, “How do you say...?” Previously this has been a question asked by hostile, disbelieving audiences who have rejected what Jesus was saying (cf. 6:42; 8:33; 12:34). That Jesus would use similar phrasing indicates that he rejects outright Philip’s understanding of the request to show them his Father. Yet Jesus does not rule out seeing *Jesus*, whether in the current narrative context or in a post-resurrection, visionary one. Someone who has a relationship with Jesus, who knows him, should understand this.

¹³⁶ Compare also Matt 4:8 // Luke 4:5; John 5:20 (2x); Acts 10:28; 1 Tim 6:15; Heb 8:5 (citing Exod 25:40); Rev 4:1; 17:1; 21:9-10; 22:1, 6, 8; and with reference to the resurrection, Luke 24:40; John 20:18.

¹³⁷ For the same point on other grounds, see Korteweg, “Reality of the Invisible.” The subtraction of “Lord” is typical, but notice that Jesus does not quote, “and it is enough for us”: he does not question that a theophany would be enough for the disciples, only the demand to have one in the first place.

After a call to Philip to believe, Jesus turns his focus to post-resurrection life. The disciples *will do* greater works than him “because I go to the Father” (14:12). Jesus *will do* whatever they ask in his name (14:13-14). Indeed, if they love him and keep his commandments (14:15), he *will ask* the Father to give them “another Paraclete” so that “he may be with you forever” (14:16), as opposed to Jesus who will be with them only a little while longer (13:33). The difference emphasized between himself and the Paraclete, however, is a matter of the sense in which each is present, not the identity of each. That is to say, the coming of the Paraclete is purposefully aligned with the coming of Jesus:

John 14:17: “This is the Spirit of Truth [i.e. *my spirit*? cf. 14:6],¹³⁸ whom the world cannot receive because it neither sees (θεωρεῖ) it nor knows it. You know it because it remains with you and will be in you.”

In fact, Jesus draws out additional parallels almost immediately:¹³⁹

John 14:19-21: “Yet a little while and *the world no longer sees* (θεωρεῖ) *me*, but you see (θεωρεῖτε) *me*. Because I live, you also will live. On that day, you will know that I am in my Father and you are in me, and *I in you*. The one who has my commandments and keeps them, that is the one who loves me. And the one who loves me will be loved by my Father, and I will love him and I will manifest myself to him (ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν).”

It goes too far to identify the Paraclete with Jesus completely, but we may identify the Paraclete with Jesus in his role as one who is *sent*, both by the Father (14:26) and by Jesus (15:26), just as Jesus may be identified with his Father who sends him.¹⁴⁰ More importantly, despite the repetition of “yet a little while,” the focus is on the social

¹³⁸ Compare Keener, *John*, 2:938 (emphasis added): “The emphasis in v. 17, then, that the Spirit of Truth, *the Spirit of Jesus*, will abide with them, indicates that they will together constitute a new temple, the place where God and Jesus dwell and manifest their presence.”

¹³⁹ For a more extensive examination of parallels between the Paraclete and Jesus, see Brown, *John*, 2:643-48, 1135-44, or more succinctly, Keener, *John*, 2:965.

¹⁴⁰ On the agency motif, see Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, 158-64.

distinction between believers who see Jesus and live, who are loved by the Father and to whom Jesus will appear, and the “world” which does not benefit in these ways.

Jesus prefaces his statements by declaring (14:18), “I will not leave you orphans; I am coming to you.” He promises that they will recognize their mutual indwelling with him and the Father “on that day.” It could be argued that ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ refers to Easter Sunday (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, 20:19) when Jesus came (ἦλθεν, 20:19) and was revealed (ἐφανερώθη, 21:14) to the disciples.¹⁴¹ Yet we have already seen how “I am coming to you” plays a role in Revelation (chapter 4 above), while manifestations “on that day,” absent the intratextual links written into the resurrection accounts, would often point to an eschatological scenario.¹⁴² In the immediate context, though, the verbal and thematic parallels with Jesus’ discussion of the coming of the other Paraclete suggest that Jesus will come to the disciples in the form of the Spirit. Temporal language that is traditionally eschatological is given a deliberate ambiguity that allows the audience to apply Jesus’ advent to his resurrection, his *parousia*, and to his spiritual presence in the church, but always to *them*.

The misunderstanding that follows, this time with Judas, underlines the contingency of the manifestation while also highlighting that it is a *new* understanding of

¹⁴¹ Frey, “Eschatology,” 68. The verb φανερώω does not appear in John 20, but it is used three times in the last chapter (21:1 [2x], 14). Consider also that Mary Magdalene sees Jesus (θεωρεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, 20:14; cp. 20:18) and the disciples see the Lord (ιδόντες τὸν κύριον, 20:20), as does Thomas (20:27, 29), but as far as we know no one else does. For other links between John 14 and 20, see Becker, *Evangelium*, 2:599-600.

¹⁴² As Wilckens takes it (*Evangelium*, 229). Many of the dozens of cases in Isaiah are open to eschatological interpretations (although not all, e.g. Isa 22:20; 23:15), and see also e.g. *1 En.* 45:3; 51:4; 62:9, 13 [*Similitudes*]; 81:4 [*Luminaries*]; 97:3; 100:4 [the *Epistle*]; Luke 10:12; 17:31; 2 Thess. 1:10; 2 Tim 1:18; 4:8; 4 Ezra 7:105; *Apoc. Elijah* 4:16; 5:1-2, 15, 36 (“On that day Christ, the King, and all his holy ones will come forth from heaven”). John is probably also aware of the usage in Zechariah (compare Zech 3:10 and the DIQ in John 1:48-50; Zech 9:9-16 and John 12:15; Zech 14:8-9 and John 7:37-38). See the texts related to the יהוה יום cited in Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 633. Frey (*Eschatologie*, 3:164) argues that 14:18 originated as a *parousia* saying but has been contextualized in the narrative to refer to Jesus’ spiritual presence.

Christ's advent. Judas asks what has happened, i.e. what has *changed* that Jesus will only manifest himself to the disciples and not to the world (14:22). John is moving away from the eschatological coming of the Son of Man, which is elsewhere consistently characterized by its universal *visibility*.¹⁴³ Jesus responds first with the condition of manifestation—keeping his word—in which case he *and his Father* will come (ἐλευσόμεθα) to them and make a dwelling place (μονήν) with them (14:23). Both the “coming” and making a dwelling place recall the opening verses. The re-use of the rare word, μονή, does not individualize or eliminate the apocalyptic message of 14:2-3,¹⁴⁴ but rather it highlights how the community of believers represents the earthly temple where God may choose to dwell temporarily, or temporally, just as the disciples may one day dwell in the eschatological temple eternally after Jesus has prepared a place for them. The ideas are not contradictory but reciprocal.

Jesus has reiterated the importance of his words throughout the farewell discourses, beginning with two self-citations and continuing with repeated commands to keep his words/commandments. This focus continues as Jesus begins to summarize his message (14:25): “I have said these things while remaining with you.” The phrasing, παρ’ ὑμῖν μένων, echoes what Jesus said about the Paraclete (παρ’ ὑμῖν μένει, 14:17), which is appropriate as Jesus returns to the subject of the Paraclete who will be sent in Jesus’ name (and so becomes his agent who is like, but not greater than, the one who sends him; cf. 13:16; 15:20). He will teach them all things and *remind them of everything Jesus has*

¹⁴³ The resurrection, which is only perceived by believers, remains a viable referent.

¹⁴⁴ As for example in C.F.D. Moule, “A Neglected Factor in the Interpretation of Johannine Eschatology,” in *Studies in John: Presented to Professor Dr. J.N. Sevenster on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (NovTSup 24; ed. A.S. Geyser; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 155-60, who reads all final eschatology in John as corporate and all realized eschatology as individual.

told them. This remembrance goes well beyond simple recall and includes the right interpretation of Jesus' words.¹⁴⁵ We may easily speculate that DIQ by the narrator is warranted by the indwelling and guidance of the Spirit, and it is probably not going too far to claim that all DIQ in the gospel that modifies the words of Jesus (or protects them from modification) would have been perceived as an expression of the Spirit's interpretive activity.

Jesus offers some words of comfort appropriate to a farewell (14:27) before citing himself again:

John 14:28-29: "You heard what I told you, 'I go' (ὑπάγω) and, 'I am coming to you'. If you loved me, you would have rejoiced that I go (πορεύομαι) to the Father,¹⁴⁶ because the Father is greater than I. And now I have told you before it happens, so that when it does happen you may believe."

There are two quotations that go with two separate issues.¹⁴⁷ First, Jesus is leaving. His real absence and the sense of loss felt by his believers cannot be dismissed by the disciples even as the authors compose the discourse to comfort and console them. Jesus is going in death and after a brief return he is going to the Father. Both departures are important: his death not only atones (cf. 1:29, 36), it is what enables Jesus to ascend to his Father, to return in the form of the Paraclete to empower and defend his believers, and to return on the last day to raise his believers up and take them with him fully into the esch-

¹⁴⁵ Destro and Pesce, "Il profetismo," 98-101. Among the verses pointing to the 'memory' and interpretation of the Johannine groups, see John 2:17, 21-22; 7:39; and especially 12:16: "His disciples did not know these things at first, but when Jesus was glorified [cf. 16:14, the Paraclete will glorify me], then they remembered these things were written of him and that they did these things to him."

¹⁴⁶ This reads: ὅτι πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. Cp. John 14:12, where ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι (here a causal ὅτι) draws another comparison: they will do greater works than Jesus *because* he goes to the Father, who is greater than he is.

¹⁴⁷ It is for this reason that Becker divides the first discourse into two sections under these headings: departure (14:4-17) and return (14:18-27) ("Abschiedsreden," 223).

atological temple. This means that all of his returns are important as well. The resurrection allows him to give the Spirit to the disciples (20:19-23) but also to fulfill the predictions of his resurrection so that the disciples may believe—not only in Jesus but also in his words. His spiritual advent protects believers from within (i.e. from distorting his teaching) and from without (as Jesus will soon explain, 15:26-16:11), and, perhaps, mitigates believers' loss through visionary experiences of the risen Christ. But the advent of the Spirit is limited to believers, and not only that, but to believers who keep Jesus' words and his commandments of love for one another.

A long passage intercedes before Jesus returns to the themes of the first farewell discourse. One of the signs of prophetic inspiration among John's group is the many "I am" sayings of the gospel, a common oracular form.¹⁴⁸ Almost as a confirmation of the ongoing role of Jesus' Spirit in the life of the church, John builds a substantial interlude on one of these sayings unique to the Fourth Gospel: "I am the true vine" (15:1-17).¹⁴⁹ The importance of Jesus' words does not recede even here, however (cf. 15:10-11, 12, 14, 18). The same theme permeates the discussion of the persecution the disciples will face, first with a citation of Jesus' words (15:20), then as evidence against the world

¹⁴⁸ While Ball wishes to distance John's use of the absolute "I am" from such instances (*I Am' in John's Gospel*, 24-45), and he is certainly correct that some of the material often cited (such as Mandaean texts) is too late to have influenced John, there is ample evidence in Egyptian texts ("I am the God Atum... I am together with my Father Atum daily") and inscriptions ("I am Isis... I am the wife and sister of King Osiris"), magical papyri (which instruct the user to invoke, "I am [say the name]"), the *Hermetica* ("I am Poimandres, the mind of authority"), and in early Christian prophetic contexts, both supposedly genuine ("I am the first and the last," Rev 1:17) and deceptive ("I am the Messiah," Matt 24:5), to suggest that John's distinct predicated "I am" sayings draw on a form of speech appropriate to an oracular context.

¹⁴⁹ Not only is this a new understanding of Christ voiced in the language of prophetic auditions, Draper argues that it incorporates the temple motif through the golden vine that adorned Herod's temple and depictions of the temple with a vine over the entrance (Draper, "Temple," 285, building on the work of W. Rordorf, "La vigne et le vin dans la tradition juive et chrétienne," in *Liturgie, Foi et Vie des Premiers Chrétiens* [TH 75; Paris: Beauchesne, 1986], 493-508). By incorporating themselves into (or grafting onto) Christ, the group becomes the earthly temple connected spiritually to the heavenly temple.

(15:22), and finally as a means to keep the disciples from stumbling (16:1) if they remember them when the hour of their enemies comes (16:4a).

As Jesus returns to the theme of his departure in much the same language as before, focus shifts away from social concerns (to whom does Jesus come?) to temporal issues: *when* can believers expect the fulfillment of Christ's promises? Jesus' introduction (16:4b-8) is laden with repetitive callbacks to the earlier discourse,¹⁵⁰ but here I will focus on two blocks of DIQ. The first occurs as Jesus concludes his discussion of the Paraclete:

John 16:12-15: "*I have many things to tell you, but you cannot bear it now. When that one comes* (ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος), the Spirit of Truth, he will guide you in all truth.¹⁵¹ *For he will not speak from himself, but whatever he will hear, he will speak and he will declare the coming things to you.*¹⁵² *He will glorify me because he will receive* (λήμψεται) *from me and will declare to you.* All that my Father has is mine. For this reason I told you, 'He receives (λαμβάνει) from me and will announce to you'."¹⁵³

Although Jesus has many things to tell them, he will not do so himself. The implication is that part of the Spirit of Truth's guidance will be *saying the things Jesus had yet to say*

¹⁵⁰ John 16:4b-8: "I did not tell you these things from the beginning because *I was with you* (cp. 7:33; 13:33; 14:9). Now *I go* (ὑπάγω) *to the one who sent me* (cp. 7:33) and none of you ask me, 'Where are you going (ὑπάγεις)?' (cp. 13:36; 14:5). But because I have said these things to you, sorrow has filled your heart. But I tell you the truth, *it is better for you* (συμφέρει ὑμῖν, cp. 11:50; 18:14) that *I go away* (ἀπέλθω), for if I do not go away (ἀπέλθω) the Paraclete will not come to you. *If I go* (πορευθῶ, cp. 14:3), I will send him to you; and *having come*, he will convict the world concerning sin and concerning righteousness and concerning judgment."

¹⁵¹ The use of the ὁδηγέω recalls Jesus' proclamation that he is the way (ὁδός) which is truth in 14:4-6; cp. also Deut 1:33, with the Lord as one who guides [LXX: ὁδηγῶν] the people on the way (Thyen, *Johannes-evangelium*, 665).

¹⁵² As Crinisor Stefan argues ("The Paraclete and Prophecy in the Johannine Community," *Pneuma* 27/2 [2005]: 273-96), the declaration of τὰ ἐρχόμενα seems to allow predictive prophetic utterances (as we see in Revelation?), but also connects to the many things (πολλά, 16:12) Jesus has yet to say to the disciples.

¹⁵³ As noted above (chapter 2), it is not entirely clear whether to include the ὅτι in the quotation ("I told you, 'Because he receives from me...'") or to consider it as marking the quotation. The latter gives a smoother reading.

when the disciples are able to bear it! Just as it was Jesus' job to voice and interpret the words of the one who sent him, it is the Paraclete's job to voice and interpret Jesus' words. The disciples are assured that they are from Jesus—the Paraclete does not improvise.¹⁵⁴

The DIQ supports this point and expands on it in an interesting way that allows temporal issues to bleed into Jesus' phrasing. First Jesus says that the Spirit *will* glorify Jesus because he *will* receive from what is Jesus' and *will* announce it to the disciples (16:14). At this point the phrasing is firmly rooted in the narrative situation, where the Spirit has not yet been given and all of its actions are future. Yet when Jesus repeats it (16:15), the Spirit *does* receive from Jesus.¹⁵⁵ It could be a Johannine sort of *variatio*, continuing the temporal tension that has been present in the farewell discourse since the opening lines (13:31-32): the Son of Man *was glorified* (ἐδοξάσθη) and yet God *will glorify* (δοξάσει) him immediately.¹⁵⁶ In many of the cases of DIQ in John 14, the verbs are in the present tense yet refer to future events. Jesus uses ἔρχομαι throughout in reference to three potential future points: the resurrection, the life of the church, and the end of time. It is possible that the use of the present with future aspect stresses the

¹⁵⁴ Wilckens (*Evangelium*, 228) and Keith A. Quan ("The Inscriptured Word: The Fourth Gospel as the Continuing Speech of the Incarnate Word," *JTI* 5/1 [2011]: 49-68) go even further, arguing that the gospel itself is identical with the testimony of the Paraclete. I would take the more moderate position that while the gospel is understood as the accomplishment of the group, especially the Beloved Disciple, many of the interpretations and unique material in John could have been credited to the Paraclete.

¹⁵⁵ Apparently some later manuscripts give the future again, harmonizing with 16:14, but they are weak enough not to be noted in the NA²⁸ (see Brown, *John*, 2:709). It may be noted that harmonizing the present and future of "declare" would only take the dropping of a λ, and so may have occurred early and often. P⁷⁵ lacks this section of text, and P⁶⁶ omits most of the verse through homoioteleuton, so there is no evidence for the verse until the fourth century at the earliest. However, textual evidence for distinct tenses for "declare" is still lacking.

¹⁵⁶ Frey (*Eschatologie*, 2:134-35) suggests that this "bitemporalen Aussage" introduces the character of the farewell discourse overall, which is both prospective (to the disciples) and retrospective (to the audience).

certainty of the intent or promise (I will *definitely* come).¹⁵⁷ Is that the reason for the switch to the present here? That is, “he will *definitely* receive from me”?¹⁵⁸

A different argument would be that the time of the story world audience blends with that of the narrative audience of the gospel.¹⁵⁹ From the perspective of the disciples, the Paraclete *will* receive from Jesus. He cannot yet receive from Jesus and declare to the disciples, a fact underlined by the narrator just after Jesus’ first declaration of his departure:

John 7:39: He said this concerning the Spirit which those who believed in him were about to receive. For the Spirit was *not yet* (οὐπω ἤν), because Jesus was *not yet* glorified (οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη).

For the gospel audience, however, the Spirit *does* receive from Jesus. By using the future then the present forms of “receive,” John effectively allows the statement to speak to both audiences.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ See above, n. 113.

¹⁵⁸ “From what is mine” (ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ) is emphasized in both quotations by being foregrounded in the sentence. In between the quotations, Jesus assures them that “all things the Father has are mine.” In chapter 14, John used DIQ to assert that direct visions of the Father were not possible, that Jesus mediates all visions but that seeing Jesus is equivalent to seeing the Father. Here it seems to do the same with *auditions*, emphasizing that the Paraclete (who Jesus specifically sends, 16:7, rather than the Father [ultimately?], 14:26) receives everything it will say *from Jesus* because everything the Father has to say is now mediated by Jesus. Hearing Jesus (through the Spirit) is equivalent to hearing the Father.

¹⁵⁹ Although he maintains the distinction between the two moments in John’s historical understanding, Frey still discusses the literary (and in some ways, philosophical) merging of temporal perspectives throughout the farewell discourse (“Die Gegenwart von Vergangenheit und Zukunft Christi: Zur ‘Verschmelzung’ der Zeithorizonte im Johannesevangelium,” in *Zeit* [JBTh 28; ed. M. Ebner et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2014], 132-58).

¹⁶⁰ One is reminded of the shift from the aorist (“consumed”) to the future (“will consume”) in John’s citation of LXX Ps 68:10 (John 2:17): the future is appropriate to the narrative setting, while the aorist of the psalm would be appropriate to the risen Christ. As Bates discusses (*Apostolic Proclamation*, 216-17), one of the factors that enables prosopological exegesis is the vagueness of either the speaker or the audience so that a more relevant audience can be inferred without violating the original text. Although in the first section of the discourse (13:31-14:31) named disciples appear often, *no description of the audience* has appeared since 14:22. In fact, only after Jesus introduces a final logion do the disciples reappear to ask what is meant (16:17). John may be deliberately vague to enable this polyvalent application.

Temporal issues come to the fore in the next few verses, both in the content of the quoted statements and in their construction. In the first farewell discourse, Jesus had told the disciples (14:19): “Yet a little while and *the world* no longer sees me (με οὐκέτι θεωρεῖ), but *you* see me (ὁμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτέ με).”¹⁶¹ The contrast was social: insiders who follow Jesus’ commandments see him; outsiders who make up the hostile world and fail to follow his commandments do not. Now Jesus paraphrases without a contrast of subjects, but of timing:

John 16:16: “A little while and you no longer see (οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτε) me, and again a little while and you will see (ὄψεσθε) me.”

Instead of who sees Jesus, the question is when. Not that the timing is exactly clear,¹⁶² and for this reason the disciples dispute Jesus’ meaning.

For the first time, the disciples quote Jesus. In fact, they offer a bumbling series of quotations:

John 16:17-18: “What is this that he says to us, ‘A little while and you do not (οὐ) see me, and again a little while and you will see me,’ and, ‘because I go to the Father’. What is this he says, the ‘little while’? We do not know what he is saying.”

¹⁶¹ Not only is the use of the pronoun emphatic (*you* see me), but its placement at the beginning of the clause (prior to δὲ) also gives it a contrastive force: not the world, but *you*. The emphatic pronoun before δὲ is the typical placement, but not a necessary one (cp. both placements in Matt 23:8, and also 1 Cor. 1:30; Phil. 4:15; and esp. Mark 13:9, where “you” is not contrastive and so moved later: “But you watch yourselves!” [βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς]).

¹⁶² Some see a reference to his death and resurrection in hours/days (e.g. Ridderbos, *John*, 538). Compare the promise of resurrection appearances in Galilee in Mark 16:7 (in DIQ) // Matt 28:7 (ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε), 10 (κακεῖ με ὄψοντα). It is also possible to hear the saying, and the “little while,” eschatologically; cp. 1 John 3:2; Mark 13:26 and pars.; Mark 14:62 // Matt 26:64; or Rev 1:7; 22:4. Still there is no reason to rule out visionary experiences allowed by the gift of the Spirit which has only just been discussed. Compare especially John 1:51, but also Matt 5:8; Heb 12:14; and the citation of Joel in Acts 2:17 (“And it will be in the last days, says God, I will pour out from my Spirit on all flesh and your sons and daughters will prophesy, and your youngsters will see visions [ὁράσεις ὄψοντα], and your elders will dream dreams”) certainly seems to apply an eschatological image to the present life of the church in a way that indicates that visionary experiences were a recognized aspect of that life. Where auditions had been discussed in 16:12-15, John now turns to visions. The temporal reference and in what sense believers will see Jesus remain unresolved.

A distinction has already been established between the now of the story and the now of the audience. Notably, given Draper's model of altered states of consciousness where purity and righteousness provide barriers to visionary experiences, Jesus originally says "because I go to the Father" to explain how the Paraclete will convict the world concerning righteousness. We might expect "*they* no longer see me," but the focus on "you" throughout keeps the argument from being distracted by social distinctions over temporal ones.

The three questions asked in 16:17, if directed at the gospel's audience, are presented almost catechetically: "What does he mean when he says..." The disciples focus on the temporal dimension of what Jesus has said in two ways. One is by drawing attention to the "little while" that has been repeated throughout. Their need to clarify this word represents an effort to flatten it, to reduce it to a single application. The Johannine authors, lovers of polyvalency that they are, resist this inclination. Notice that Jesus never directly clarifies what he means by the "little while," allowing all of its applications to stand. Another way that temporal concerns are reflected in the quotations is a small but important paraphrase: "you *no longer* see me" becomes, "you *don't* see me."¹⁶³ Like the shift from future to present in 16:14-15, simplifying οὐκέτι to οὐ coincides with a shift in perspective from the time of the disciples, who see Jesus presently but soon will *no longer* see him as they do now, to the time of the gospel's audience which has probably never seen Jesus in the flesh.

Importantly, Jesus endorses their paraphrase. When he asks them rhetorically if they are discussing what he just said, he also uses οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με. There will be people

¹⁶³ For textual confusion in 16:17-19, see the Appendix.

for whom “you don’t see me” is appropriate even if, in a little while, they may see him, mystically and eschatologically. As Jesus launches into the image of the woman in labor (16:20-22), he acknowledges the pain that his absence, his death, will cause the disciples. Within the story the disciples already recognize that going to Jerusalem means death to Jesus (cf. 11:16), and they have recognized that Jesus uses departure language to refer to his imminent death (cf. 13:33-38).¹⁶⁴ Outside of the story, it would be a very ill-informed audience that does not realize that death is in view, especially as the narrator has turned to the audience multiple times to clarify that Jesus was going to die (cf. 2:22; 5:18; 7:1; 12:10, 33; 13:1-3). The generic markers that John has hit in constructing the farewell discourse all point to Jesus’ death, sooner than later.

Yet John needs to account for other departures. If Jesus came back in resurrection, why did he not stay with the disciples? Why is he not present in a physical way, one not contingent on belief?¹⁶⁵ John counters by arguing that Jesus not only ascended to the Father after appearing to Mary Magdalene and the disciples, but that it was for their benefit that he did (16:7).¹⁶⁶ Yet he is present in the group through the sending of the Paraclete. Whether we view the Paraclete as Jesus’ alter ego, his agent, or his spirit, the Paraclete’s role is to mediate Jesus’ presence with the disciples after his departure to the

¹⁶⁴ Perhaps an even stronger point is that the Jews recognize that Jesus uses departure language to refer to his death all the way back in 8:22, even if they misunderstand how he will die and what it will mean.

¹⁶⁵ A similar position, that the issue is not Jesus’ death but his return, is taken by Frey (*Eschatologie*, 2:230) on John 16:16-19: “die für die Lesergemeinde virulente Problematik nicht in der für die Jünger des Irdischen einst bedrohlichen Nähe seines Weggangs, sondern im Verständnis der Ankündigung des baldigen Wiedersehens und der damit verbundenen Zeitspanne bestand.”

¹⁶⁶ There is some disagreement whether Jesus ascends after his appearance to Mary Magdalene (cf. 20:17, “Do not hold onto me—I have not yet ascended to the Father”) or after his final resurrection appearance (for discussion, see Keener, *John*, 2:1192-95). Jesus probably ascends after appearing to Mary Magdalene, and perhaps in between each of the other appearances, although there is an implied final ascent when Jesus will no longer descend bodily until the last day.

Father. Here I have supported the model of Johannine prophetism in which Jesus is understood to communicate and to appear to the group through some sort of cultic activity, most likely visions in a group setting. Such a model allows the Johannine group to interpret traditions through oracular “I am” statements, e.g. “I am the gate” in the parable of the sheep, or “I am the way” to the Father. It also accounts for the visionary language that appears throughout John, especially in the farewell discourse. Such a model does not eliminate the role of metaphors and figurative language though: most likely the majority of John’s audience “heard” the words of Jesus through the gospel and through the teachings of the elders/leaders. Most likely they “saw” Jesus through visual language in storytelling.¹⁶⁷ Any experience of Christ that leads to belief is preferable to none.

What is a concern to John is that experience of Christ is not relegated exclusively to the past, the miraculous earthly life and resurrection of Jesus, and to the future, his miraculous return to the world in victory. John grounds the words of Jesus in past teachings, only allowing them to be altered as far as a paraphrase or a double-meaning will allow. But in doing so it makes the teachings contemporary to its audience, allowing Jesus to speak to his disciples in the past (*this is the one I said... the Paraclete will receive... you no longer see me...*) and to the audience in the present (*this was the one I said... the Spirit does receive... you do not see me...*). As the farewell discourse comes

¹⁶⁷ Gail R. O’Day expresses the point well: “as the Gospel story unfolds, the Johannine narrative places the enfleshed Word before the reader. In this way, the reader is given firsthand experience of the enfleshed Word” (“‘I Have Said These Things to You...’: The Unsettled Place of Jesus’ Discourses in Literary Approaches to the Fourth Gospel,” in *Word, Theology, and Community in John* [ed. J. Painter, R.A. Culpepper, and F.F. Segovia; St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002], 147-52, here 147). So also Wilckens, *Evangelium*, 217: “So realistisch lässt der Joh.evangelist seine Leser zusammen mit den Jüngern auf das Sterben Jesu blicken!”

to a close in Jesus' final prayer, he returns to the language of being with the disciples, again addressing the social and temporal concerns that have followed the material:

John 17:24-26: "Father, what you have given me, I wish that where *I* am, *they* also may be with me, so that they may see my glory which you have given me... Righteous Father, *the world* did not know you, but *I* knew you and *they* knew that you sent me. And I *made* your name known to them, and I *will make* it known."

At this point, Jesus heads out to his arrest.

Just as John began by discussing only Jesus' departure (7:33-34; 8:21; 13:33), it ends by discussing only Jesus' return. As the gospel closes, Jesus casually uses "until I come" (21:22) as a deliberately hyperbolic time reference pointing to the *parousia*: *If I want him to remain all the way until the time that I come, far distant though it might be, what is it to you?* At this point in the narrative, Jesus has already come in incarnation, in public ministry, and in resurrection, always using this verb. He will also come to the church through the Spirit, but this advent does not provide an adequately distant time stamp for Jesus' purposes and so can be set to the side for the moment.¹⁶⁸ His eschatological advent needs no argument in support after the development of the farewell discourse, but instead can be used as a rhetorical tool without comment.

Conclusion

The ideology of the Gospel of John includes an intense focus on keeping the words of Jesus because he received his teaching from his Father and said nothing from

¹⁶⁸ In a sense, the time reference of "until I come" is equivalent to the more typically Johannine εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, but John seems bound by traditional phrasing. That the author of John 21, whoever he may have been, felt that this phrase was understandable argues that in the minds of the Johannine group, it is not always or in all ways appropriate to say that Jesus comes now. Final eschatology was a strong part of the group's ideology *at the time of the gospel's composition*, whether it had always been or not.

himself. Which means one may not overtly add to his words.¹⁶⁹ As ideas develop and change, the group evidently understood its innovations as truly in line with traditions that it traced back to Jesus. The range of meanings imparted to those words occasionally needed to be stretched and shrunk. A basic Greek education provided the group with two ways of adapting the teachings to new situations: polyvalency and paraphrase. The literary evidence of the gospel demonstrates how practiced its authors were in these devices. But the devices also provide an intrinsic protection from stretching the interpretation of Jesus' words beyond a perceived breaking point. A wealth of meaning may be mined from a single logion, but the meaning *must be grounded in the saying*. For this reason, some version of the base 'text' (or rather, tradition) is often presented alongside its interpretation.¹⁷⁰

Sayings that are traditional to Johannine groups often appear in quotation, which not only works to present the Fourth Gospel as a forensic document but also serves as a pedagogical aide to the audience. The two aspects can work together to *advocate for* interpretations especially emphasized among Johannine groups while *arguing against* interpretations that the groups or at least the authors disagree with, such as the possibility of a direct vision of the Father without Jesus' mediation. The audience learns not to expect direct theophanies, and is warned against anyone who promises to show them the Father.

¹⁶⁹ Recall that no additions are used in paraphrases of what Jesus has said.

¹⁷⁰ The same interpretive methods are applied to Scripture, but in that case the text is already well-established. That a handful of sayings are quoted by Jesus without presenting the original text, as is the case with the Baptist's testimony or the saying in 14:2, suggests they are familiar enough to the audience not to require an 'original' citation, and probably that the audience would notice on its own any paraphrases.

Within the group of sayings we have tracked in this chapter, I would argue for something like the following as a cluster of traditions that John works with:

- a. I am going (ὑπάγω, or perhaps πορεύομαι)

The Synoptic tradition speaks of the Son of Man *going*, and Revelation speaks of following the Lamb where he *goes*. Although applied in different ways, both have the death of Jesus in view. Traditions that Jesus knew about his death beforehand are widespread, and wherever his absence was strongly felt such foreknowledge would act as a consolation. In John, Jesus' foreknowledge is greatly heightened, and correspondingly Jesus' acknowledgements that he goes are multiplied and amplified.

- b. A little while and you no longer see me, and again a little while and you see me.

It is very difficult, and in the end quite speculative, to decide which of the various "little while" sayings shows the least literary development. There are two reasons to suspect that the social contrast as it is presented in 14:19 ("a little while and the world no longer sees me, but you see me") is a development of the Fourth Gospel. First, "the world" is an especially Johannine way to refer to outsiders or deficient believers (cf. 1:10; 7:7; 8:23; 14:17, 27; 15:19; 16:8, 20; 17:6, 14-16, 25). Second, John has Judas object to this specific interpretation of Jesus' teaching while advocating for a more traditional understanding of how Jesus will be manifested. In other words, John takes time to justify the interpretation. Meanwhile the temporal contrast between disciples and current believers ("a little while and you no longer see me, and again a little while and you will see me")

serves more or less as a passion prediction absent of any context.¹⁷¹ The saying could apply to the disciples both at the resurrection and at the *parousia*, if “a little while” is given its typical apocalyptic resonance. An apparent temporal modification has been introduced in the quotation, changing the “no longer” that has been used several times already (14:19; 16:10, 16) to the present, “you do not see me.” Now the saying more appropriately applies to the audience who will see Jesus through belief and at the *parousia*.

c. I go to prepare a place for you.

If the critical text is correct about how this logion is introduced, and if it is correctly read as a quotation (whether direct or indirect), then John marks it as a tradition that the audience would not only recognize as coming from Jesus, but also one strong enough that it did not need to be stated previously in the narrative to foster a recollection. The phrasing is not particularly Johannine, and it draws on OT language and themes from texts that John’s authors evidently valued, including Deuteronomy and Isaiah. John probably does endorse the idea that Jesus goes to heaven to prepare a place for the disciples in the heavenly temple. If believers enter the “place” at their deaths as the patristic writers took it, John does not elaborate. Instead it seems that John picks up especially Enochic images—from the *Similitudes*, added to *1 Enoch* at some point in the first century,¹⁷² but also from the core vision in the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Epistle*—that are already embedded in visionary and eschatological texts, reappropriating them to the presence of Jesus among believers. By the end of the chapter, the group of believers has become the

¹⁷¹ See above n. 86 and Zumstein (“Jesus’ Resurrection,” 105). However, even here I suspect that a change from “you see me” (θεωρεῖτέ με) to “you will see me” (ὄψεσθε με) has been introduced to highlight the temporal contrast between present and future.

¹⁷² Isaac, “1 Enoch,” 7.

earthly temple where the Father, and with him Jesus, may come and find a room, a dwelling place, just as the Father once did in the Jerusalem temple. While this development is well-recognized, at no time does John argue against the apocalyptic and final eschatological aspects of the tradition it invokes.

d. Where I am, [you cannot come/you may also be].

A strong point for the traditional nature of these sayings is the consistent wording/word order (ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ). In each case emphatic pronouns are also used for the others, whether Jesus is contrasting himself with the Jews or aligning himself with the disciples.¹⁷³ It is difficult to determine which sentiment is more original, although I suspect that “where I am, you may also be” is the tradition being built on while “you cannot come” combines this motif with another, that “it is not possible to come to Jesus” unless certain criteria are met (6:44, 65). Through repetition and paraphrase, John contrasts the Jews with believers and highlights several misunderstandings of where Jesus is and why it is inaccessible to certain people or at certain times.

e. I am with you.

Not only does the saying tie into a prevalent scriptural motif, it is echoed widely in the other literature of the New Testament. John applies the saying to Jesus’ earthly life and the present life of the church, as do the Synoptics. The valence that Jesus is on their side is not argued against, but it is emphasized more clearly with the other Paraclete or Advocate, who will be with believers and on their side in their post-resurrection struggles.

¹⁷³ The contrast is quite close with the Jews (7:34, 36), where ὑμεῖς follows immediately after ἐγὼ. With believers, καὶ intervenes almost by necessity (14:3, καὶ ὑμεῖς; 17:24, καὶ ἐκεῖνοι).

f. If I want him to remain until I come, what is it to you?

John marks the saying as pre-gospel tradition that has been inadequately paraphrased to mean that the Beloved Disciple either *is not dying* or *will certainly not die* until Jesus comes. The temporal framework of the *parousia* is not disputed, only the notion that certain people who knew Jesus in earthly life will not die until it arrives.

As the Gospel of John portrays it, God was present on earth through Jesus in his earthly life and again, briefly, in resurrection. But these moments are past, and in the first century, narrowly missed. God will also be present through the coming of the Son of Man on the last day, when all will see his glory. But this moment, although always expected imminently, “in a little while,” is potentially a long time coming. At the end of the first century, it must have been clear that anyone might live and die before seeing that day. The tangible, visible intervention of God in the world may be recalled or expected, but often seems to take place in the distant past or the distant future. Either way, the time is not now.¹⁷⁴ John works in various ways to console its audience regarding Jesus’ departure, and to assure it that Jesus not only will return but he also *does* return through the Spirit that is already evident in the cultic life of the group.¹⁷⁵ Prophetic and visionary experiences most likely existed among the Johannine groups, although it is far from certain

¹⁷⁴ Within ancient Judaism generally, this is a phenomenon addressed by Richard Elliott Friedman, *The Hidden Face of God* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1997). Discussing the movement of Jewish religion into Christianity and rabbinic Judaism, Friedman concludes: “The kernel of the concept of the diminishing apparent presence of God thus was present in Judaism and Christianity. It was present in the legacy of the Hebrew Bible and present in the literature that each religion added and treasured” (p. 140). It is notable that the quality even of God’s apparent absence is projected onto Jesus.

¹⁷⁵ Paul likewise uses spiritual phenomena to connect Christ’s life to the present experience in the church, and he uses direct quotation, internal to his and his audience’s shared experiences, to make the case (Gal 4:4-7): “God sent out his Son, born of a woman... so that we might receive adoption as sons. Because you are sons, God sent out the Spirit of his Son (cp. John 14:17, 26) into our hearts, crying, ‘Abba! Father!’ So that you are no longer a slave (cp. John 15:15) but a son.”

that they were universal experiences. For those who specialized in prophetic gifts, John argues that Jesus through the gift of his Spirit is the unique mediator of auditions and visions of the Father. It is impossible to see the Father. It is enough to see Jesus.

For those who do not share in these experiences, whether in the moment or at all, John assures them that the works that Jesus continues to do within the group are evidence that he comes to them, in some sense similar to how he came to them through the incarnation. While some in the group may see or at least claim to see Jesus, the others are valued for their ability to believe without seeing and for their trust that, through their belief in the glory shown in Jesus' life and especially his death, they will see Jesus come in a glory visible to the world. The narrative also presents them with a test of the messages that others deliver: the Spirit receives only from what is Jesus'. He does not speak from himself, but reminds them of what Jesus said, interpreting it certainly, teasing out the spiritual truth behind it, but unable to leave Jesus' words behind altogether. As we have seen, the notion of Jesus' spiritual and real presence in the church *now* is not unique to John in the New Testament literature. But there always exists the danger of false prophets and false teachers, and thus the need to "test the spirits" so to speak when someone in the group has a vision of Jesus or delivers a message from him.¹⁷⁶ By setting up the criterion that these messages must be anchored to Jesus' words, whether through finding additional meaning in them, paraphrasing them, or quoting them in new contexts, the members of

¹⁷⁶ The reality of these spiritual experiences to the authors necessitates a spiritual model of discernment evident in 1 John 4:1-6 that allows for both the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of deception (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης): the spiritual event is not questioned even if the nature of the spirit is, here if it does not confess Jesus having come in the flesh. However, it would be naïve to assert that ancient Johannine believers could not fake a spiritual experience, or that those who had had spiritual experiences would not be aware of this possibility.

the group who observe the ecstatic experience and vouch for it, are able to keep his words and to prevent teachings from going too far astray.

APPENDIX: GRAMMATICAL AND TEXTUAL ISSUES

“Amen, amen I say to you, if anyone keeps my word, he will not see death forever.” Then the Jews said, “Now we know that you have a demon! Abraham died, and the prophets, and you say, ‘If anyone keeps my word, he will never taste death’!”

John 8:51-52

“Whoever eats of this bread will live forever.” Surely there he calls the saving doctrines and faith in him ‘bread’, or his own body. For both enervate the soul. And indeed elsewhere he said, “If anyone hears my word, he will not taste death,” and they were offended.

John Chrysostom, *Hom. In Io.* 46¹

General Grammatical Considerations

As can be seen in Table 1.1, the present list of cases of DIQ in this study is considerably longer than any in the previous studies. This is in part due to a conscious effort not to limit unnecessarily the study’s scope in order to be as comprehensive as possible. It is also due to the inclusion of cases that many would no doubt consider indirect quotations, and which are in fact punctuated as such in various critical editions and translations. Because I wish to consider only direct quotations, the ambiguity presented by John’s construction of some of these cases deserves attention.

John is notably averse to accusative and infinitive constructions that clearly mark indirect quotations in other literature, as we saw above (chapter 4 n. 7), for example, in *Acts of Pilate* 1.1, literally, “He says himself to be God’s Son” (λέγει ἑαυτὸν εἶναι υἱὸν θεοῦ).² Instead, John uses nominative indicative constructions, sometimes with the

¹ My translation; see PG 59 col. 259 for the Greek. Elsewhere (*Hom.* 39) Chrysostom draws attention to the change of wording in the quotation by the Jews, so the confusion is not a matter of textual tradition.

² Although see John 15:15 with an accusative construction, “I no longer call you slaves” (οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους), rather than a nominative construction, as it appears in 13:13, “You call me, ‘Teacher’” (ὁμοῖς φωνεῖτέ με ὁ διδάσκαλος). For a survey of indirect speech forms, see Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (BLG 2; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 270-75.

particle ὅτι, sometimes without. Twenty-three cases lack ὅτι in Table 1.2 (plus the second quotation in 10:36), as in John 14:9: πῶς σὺ λέγεις δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα; (“How do you say, ‘Show us the Father?’”). Such constructions in John, when they contain a quotation at all, are universally translated as direct quotes.³ At other times John introduces the particle ὅτι, which brings with it some ambiguity whether a direct or indirect quote is intended.⁴ A notable example of John’s fluidity on this point occurs in two cases of DIQ attached to Jesus’ use of “I am” in 18:5, first from the narrator and then from Jesus himself:

John 18:6: ὥς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἐγὼ εἰμι...
Therefore when he said to them, “I am”...

John 18:8: εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι.
“I told you that I am” or “I told you, ‘I am’.”

³ Although all cases where the quotation is introduced without ὅτι are read as direct quotes in the translations and critical editions, this does not imply that some judgment is not needed. In 14:9, both λέγεις and δεῖξον are in the second person singular, but the context tells us that the referent (the ‘you’) is different for each verb: “How do *you* (Philip) say, ‘*You* (Jesus) show us the Father?’” In John 4:39, the narrator reproduces the woman’s comment from 4:29. The isolated phrase that is quoted, εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα could technically be translated, “He said to me, ‘All things that I did...’” (perhaps more so if πάντα ἃ is read in the nominative). The context of the original statement, however, rules this out. In the case of 10:25, it is possible to read it as, “I told you, ‘And you do not believe’” (εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε), especially because the three words then quoted have appeared already, although in different scenes (cf. 3:12; 6:36). However, Jesus is responding to the demand of the Jews to tell them openly (εἰπὼν ἡμῖν παρησιᾷ, 10:24) if he is the Christ, and he answers elliptically that he has told them and yet they do not believe. No claim is being made about his exact wording. So although the list could be expanded even more, contextual clues often play a role in ruling them out.

⁴ Anneli Aejmelaeus (“*Oti Recitativum* in Septuagintal Greek,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* [MSU XX; ed. D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990], 74-82) argues that the ambiguity is unresolvable since the use of ὅτι-*recitativum* “represents an intermediate form between direct speech quoting a person’s words in their original wording and indirect speech expressing the content of a person’s words from the viewpoint of the narrator in subordinate form as an object clause” (p. 74), although later she admits that λέγων ὅτι introduces both direct and indirect speech in the LXX (p. 78). John occasionally uses ὅτι in cases that are universally read as indirect (see on John 18:37 below) while also using ὅτι to introduce direct recitations of previous speech (e.g. 4:39/4:29; 13:33/8:21; 18:8/18:5). It appears that ὅτι has a significant range in John when introducing speech that must be dealt with on its own terms.

The second re-quotation can be read either way, which raises the question: does John intend any nuance through the introduction of ὅτι? Johannine grammarians disagree on this point. Noack tends always to read direct speech in the absence of any compelling reason to doubt it, such as a combination of persons.⁵ For example, the message of the sick man to the Jews (5:15, “he proclaimed to the Jews that Jesus is the one who made him well”) is indirect because it refers to Jesus as the one who made “him” (not “me”) well.

By contrast, Abbott argues for a “general absence of ὅτι recitativum” introducing words of Christ, “except in two or three instances where sayings of Christ are repeated for the second time.”⁶ Abbott does not indicate which two or three instances he has in mind, but he uses the case in 18:5-8 (cited above) to illustrate his point that John differentiates between direct and indirect speech through the absence or presence of ὅτι. In his reading, John 18:8 with the particle should read, “I told you *that* I am.” Arguably this case works because the first instance (18:6) focuses on the utterance of the potent words “I am,” while the second (18:8) focuses again on Jesus’ acknowledgement of the name Jesus the Nazarene.⁷ Unfortunately, it is unclear whether *which character is quoted* (by

⁵ Noack, *Tradition*, 136. Stephen H. Levinsohn, “ὅτι *Recitativum* in John’s Gospel: A Stylistic or a Pragmatic Device?” *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota* 43 [1999]: 1-14, here 3, accessed at http://arts-sciences.und.edu/summer-institute-of-linguistics/work-papers/_files/docs/1999-levinsohn.pdf, January 17, 2016) would seem to agree, reading by default direct speech whenever ὅτι is present unless compelled otherwise, although he gives careful attention to those cases where John violates this principle.

⁶ Abbott, *Grammar*, 162-63.

⁷ Levinsohn, “ὅτι *Recitativum*,” 10, offers three additional explanations for the introduction of the particle: 1) John alternates uses of ὅτι (tied also to the presence of a secondary, often causal, ὅτι; see below), so that, since 18:5 is introduced without the particle, 18:8 is introduced with it (it is not clear then why the inter-

the narrator) has so much influence over our grammatical interpretation in all cases, and it is particularly those points where the words of Jesus (and of others) are *repeated* that are under examination, so the ambiguity remains.

There are several indicators that John is not so grammatically precise. First let us look at the characteristically Johannine formula, “Amen, amen I say to you...” Jesus introduces a saying with this formula 25 times.⁸ Yet in seven of these (3:11; 5:24, 25; 8:34; 10:7; 13:21; 16:20), ὅτι is inserted prior to the quoted logion. John can alternate in close succession, as he does in 5:19, which lacks the particle, followed by 5:24, 25, which have it. No distinction in the variant formulations has been suggested, particularly with regards to direct and indirect speech, nor is any reflected in the translations.⁹

vening quotation in 18:6 does not carry the particle—is it due to editing?); 2) the quotation marked by ὅτι could be indirect to remove focus from it in order to highlight the *following* speech act, in which case Jesus’ self-quotation (“I am”) is preliminary to his request to let the disciples go (this would conflict with Levinsohn’s own explanation of John’s use of ὅτι in double amen sayings; see n. 9 below); 3) directly contradicting the last point, self-citations should be granted direct status by default whether the particle is present or not, although the absence of ὅτι indicates to Levinsohn a greater degree of identity between the original speech act and the quotation. It does not seem that Jesus is portrayed as saying something different in 18:5, 8 (in both cases, “I am [Jesus the Nazorean]”), so it is unclear how the presence of ὅτι would impact a self-citation at all under point 3). The first explanation is stylistic and may go either way with direct quotations, the second is hypothetical and dependent on Levinsohn’s idiosyncratic reading of certain scenes, and the third assumes direct quotation in one category (self-citation) while saying nothing about the many cases where one character quotes another. The ambiguity remains.

⁸ The double amen occurs in John 1:51; 3:3, 5, 11; 5:19, 24, 25; 6:26, 32, 47, 53; 8:34, 51, 58; 10:1, 7; 12:24; 13:16, 20, 21, 38; 14:12; 16:20, 23; 21:18. ὅτι is missing in P⁷⁵ and B for 10:7. Various introductions of ὅτι occur in 16:23, including P^{22vid}, א, A, and W, but NA²⁸ has accepted ἄν τι based on P⁵, B, and C.

⁹ However, Levinsohn (“ὅτι *Recitativum*,” 11-13) argues that the presence of ὅτι signals that the following assertion explains, clarifies or otherwise makes explicit some previous point, while the absence of ὅτι signals that a new point is being introduced; he gives as his key example 10:1, which alters the image from sight (cf. 9:39-41) to shepherding (and lacks the particle), and 10:7, which explains the parable in 10:1-5 (and has the particle). If he is right, ὅτι is exegetically important but immaterial in determining whether direct speech is meant or not. The Synoptic formulations (using a single amen) also vary in their use of ὅτι. Mark, for instance, uses ὅτι in nine out of 13 cases. Matthew and Luke generally follow Mark when they replicate his amen formula (which is rare in Luke), but there are cases both where ὅτι is *dropped* by the later evangelists (Matt 10:42 // Mark 9:41; Matt 21:21 // Mark 11:23; Luke 9:27 // Mark 9:1, although here Luke paraphrases, λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς) and where ὅτι is *introduced* where Mark lacks it (both Luke 18:29

In some cases the lack of ὅτι may be due to peripheral, stylistic concerns rather than a need to distinguish between direct and indirect speech. For example, John never uses ὅτι when the statement begins with a vocative noun (most often κύριε).¹⁰ John also tends not to use ὅτι to introduce speech if there is a secondary ὅτι already present. The most frequent construction is “because x said,” as we see in 6:41: “Then the Jews were grumbling about him *because he said* (ὅτι εἶπεν), ‘I am the bread that came down from heaven’.”¹¹ The shift in person here would eliminate confusion were ὅτι present, so it may be that the author wanted to avoid ὅτι εἶπεν ὅτι (unlike the author of Rev 3:17; 18:7). John is not totally consistent on this point, however, and provides one or possibly two counter-examples (1:50; 3:28). Still, it would seem that the authors of John shy away from overloading sentences with the particle. It is a stylistic concern that influences seven

and Matt 19:28 add it to the formulation in Mark 10:29). C. H. Turner (“Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel (VII),” *JThS* 28 [1926]: 9-30) notes that outside of the amen-sayings Matthew and Luke generally drop ὅτι, but almost always retain them with amen-sayings (however he does not connect Mark 9:41 to Matt 10:42, despite, at worst [e.g. in D], close wording; he agrees with \aleph , D, and W against the present NA²⁸ that ὅτι is absent in Mark 11:23, and Mark 9:1 is absent from his survey).

¹⁰ Ignoring John 5:7 (since John never uses ὅτι with ἀποκρίνομαι alone; Levinsohn, “ὅτι *Recitativum*,” 3), John has 30 cases of κύριε introduced by λέγω; there are also seven cases of ῥαββί plus one of ῥαββουνί, and three cases of πᾶτερ introduced by λέγω, bringing the total to at least 41 cases with the vocative that lack ὅτι. In two cases of DIQ the vocative is eliminated in recitation (14:9/14:8 and 21:17 where Σίμων [Ἰωάννου], serving as a vocative, is eliminated), but elsewhere it is kept with both citations lacking the particle (21:20/13:25).

¹¹ Levinsohn, “ὅτι *Recitativum*,” 5-7. For other examples of causal ὅτι, see John 8:22; 10:36c; 16:19; 21:17. Elsewhere ὅτι may serve other functions, as in 3:7 (“Do not be amazed *that* [or: because] I said...”) or 3:28 (“You testify *that* I said...”); cf. also 13:29. John 19:21 is ambiguous (Ensor, *Jesus and his ‘Works’*, 60 n. 58) because the ὅτι could (inconsistently) go with the imperative γράφε: “Do not write, ‘King of the Jews,’ but *that* he said, ‘I am King of the Jews’” (e.g. NASB). Noack (*Tradition*, 136) along with the NRSV and NKJV connect it to γράφε in a direct manner: “Do not write, ‘King of the Jews,’ but, ‘He said, ‘I am King of the Jews’”.” Since the first command to write carries no ὅτι and the message gives the reason for Jesus’ crucifixion, it is even possible (if unlikely) to take it causally here: “Do not write, ‘King of the Jews,’ but, ‘*Because* he said, ‘I am King of the Jews’”.” Whatever the case, the secondary ὅτι (whether causal or connected to γράφε) discourages the use of ὅτι after ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν.

instances of DIQ, undermining the position that the absence of ὅτι indicates only a desire to clearly mark direct speech.

Meanwhile John uses ὅτι to introduce direct speech more than any other NT text save Mark.¹² The problem is that the Fourth Gospel still uses the particle to introduce *indirect* speech. In response to Pilate's suggestion that Jesus considers himself a king, Jesus answers:

Σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι. "You say *that* I am a king."

It is the change in *person* that suggests that this is the proper reading: the referent of 'you say' is unlikely to be the same as the referent of 'I am'.¹³ Furthermore Jesus' response mirrors Pilate's question in the same verse:

Οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ; "So then you are a king?"¹⁴

The possibility of a double-entendre—a direct quote with the referent of both verbs identical, "You say, 'I am king'," may also be heard—is an intriguing one given that their

¹² Noack, *Tradition*, 135 and BDF, 246-47. Margaret G. Kim (*Marking Thought in New Testament Greek: New Light from Linguistics on the Particles ἵνα and ὅτι* [Eugene: Pickwick, 2010], 153) points out that there are around 120 cases in the NT where ὅτι introduces direct speech, and it is also common in the *Discourses of Epictetus*.

¹³ Noack, *Tradition*, 136 suggests that the ὅτι can be taken as causal: "You say [so] *because* I am [in fact] King!" This is very unlikely, and it may be forced by Noack's conviction that λέγειν + ὅτι rarely introduces indirect discourse, but it remains a possibility. See also Levinsohn, "ὅτι *Recitativum*," 2 nn. 4, 8 on the change of person.

¹⁴ There is some discussion whether Pilate's statement should be punctuated as a question or as an exclamation in response to Jesus' immediately preceding statement about his kingdom (18:36), "So then you *are* a king!" The parallelism is augmented in A and later uncials with the addition of an extra ἐγώ at the end of the sentence (in this case, βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ is matched by βασιλεὺς εἰμι ἐγώ). Conversely, since the next sentence begins with ἐγώ (so that the two identical pronouns would sit side by side), the wording may have been refined to eliminate the duplication, or the second ἐγώ may have dropped out in transmission. Alternatively still, by merely shifting the stop after ἐγώ, the parallelism is maintained without breaking the syntax of the following sentence: σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμι ἐγώ. εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον. For a fuller discussion of this verb and a defense of this last punctuation, see Jane Heath, "'You Say that I Am a King' (John 18.37)," *JSNT* 34/3 (2012): 232-53.

entire discussion works to undermine Pilate's claims to authority (see especially 19:10-11) and to demonstrate Jesus' sovereignty and control. This reading, however, is unnecessary and demonstrates that paying attention to person and context is important in determining which quotes are direct and which indirect.¹⁵

Another notable case where person helps to detect direct speech also highlights John's lack of precise distinction between the presence or absence of ὅτι. After the Jews claim that they are going to stone Jesus "for blasphemy" (περὶ βλασφημίας, 10:33), Jesus asks:

John 10:36: ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι;
 "Do you say, 'You blaspheme,' because I said, 'I am [the] Son of God'?"

"Do you [pl.] say *that* you [sing.] blaspheme" makes little sense.¹⁶ Notice also that although John uses ὅτι in the first quotation, it fails to in the second quotation probably due to the causal ὅτι that links the clauses. A quotation with the particle sits side by side with one that lacks it for reasons having nothing to do with direct and indirect speech.¹⁷

Using the particle in a causal sense introduces ambiguity into two quotations from chapter 16, since it is unclear whether the ὅτι is part of the quotation or merely introduces it. The ὅτι in John 16:17 is often taken as part of the quotation ("*because* [ὅτι] I go to the Father," cf. 16:10),¹⁸ in part because two quotations are depicted here and the first is introduced without the particle. As 10:36 (and possibly 3:28) illustrates, this is not *neces-*

¹⁵ For additional cases of indirect quotations using this construction that are detectable through person, see 5:15; 9:17.

¹⁶ BDF, 247 calls this verse "a characteristic example" of ὅτι-recitativum; see also BDAG, 589.

¹⁷ See also 21:23 and many witnesses of 3:28; outside of DIQ, see 7:12; 9:9; 20:13.

¹⁸ See above, chapter 2 n. 68 for further discussion.

sarily the case (since the second quote could be marked by ὅτι to recall the speaking verb),¹⁹ but it is likely. Shortly before this, though, in 16:15 Jesus quotes what he just said in 16:14. In the first statement the ὅτι is causal: “That one will glorify me *because* he will receive from me and announce to you.” Yet when the ὅτι is reproduced after εἶπον in the next verse, translators tend to alter its syntactical force and attach it to the speaking verb: “For this reason (διὰ τοῦτο) I said (εἶπον ὅτι), ‘He receives from me and will announce to you.’”²⁰ In either case, the impact on the quotation is not terribly dramatic. Perhaps for this reason the author did not go out of the way to avoid the ambiguity.²¹

Another indicator of direct speech is the presence of an imperative verb in the reported statement.²² Two cases occur in chapter 9 that illustrate this well. The formerly blind man reports that Jesus told him, “Go!” (εἰπέν μοι ὅτι ὕπαγε, 9:11). Here the particle is best left untranslated since the referent of “me” and the recipient of the command are identical. It is not necessary for the imperative to lead the quoted statement either, as is evident after the narrator explains that the Jews had already decided to expel anyone who confessed Jesus as the Christ (9:22):

¹⁹ In this case, the line would read: “What is this that he says to us, ‘A little while and you do not see me, and again a little while and you will see me’, and, ‘I go to the Father’?”

²⁰ Taking the ὅτι with the speaking verb allows an indirect quotation (as it is in the critical editions and English translations). Taking the particle as part of the quotation (and therefore as causal) would lean the verse heavily toward direct quotation instead. Incidentally, all statements introduced with διὰ + accusative carry ὅτι after the speaking verb (see also 4:39; 6:65; 9:23; 13:11).

²¹ For another example of this ambiguity, Schulze (*Charakter*, 68) reads the heavily paraphrased quotation in 9:41 with a causal ὅτι, “But now you say, ‘Because we see’ (ὅτι βλέπομεν)” instead of the more typical, “But now you say, ‘We see’.”

²² As the example of 14:9 cited above demonstrates, the imperative does not force the use of ὅτι.

John 9:23: διὰ τοῦτο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπαν ὅτι ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσατε.

Because of this his parents said, “He is of age, ask him!”

Had the sentence ended with ἔχει, we might read: His parents said *that* he is of age.²³ It is the imperative at the end of the sentence, and the combination of persons it introduces, that forces the direct quote.

Still, nearly 20 cases remain ambiguous.²⁴ Abbott attempts to impose an additional rule whereby inexact cases should be rendered indirect but this immediately fails in view of 18:9, which he traces to the quite differently worded statement in 17:12, but which uses ὅτι.²⁵ When inexact *direct* quotations nonetheless force ὅτι on Abbott, he reinterprets the particle as meaning “[to this effect] that” (e.g. 9:41/9:40; 10:36/10:33). It appears simpler to accept that a hard and fast rule for all functions of ὅτι with a speech verb is untenable, and that context will often dictate if and when we treat a quotation as direct or indirect.

²³ In this case, the pre-verbal αὐτοῦ is identical with the subject of ἔχει and the αὐτόν within the reported speech, causing the ambiguity.

²⁴ Ensor (*Jesus and His ‘Works’*, 60 n. 58), examining all uses of ὅτι to introduce speech, claims that 4:17, 39; 6:42; 8:33, 54; 9:11, 23, 41; 10:36; 13:11; and 18:9 “clearly introduce direct speech.” In every case, person or the presence of an imperative verb supports this. He adds that 1:34; 3:28; and 11:51 “clearly introduce indirect speech,” although in all three cases I would argue that some ambiguity remains. John 1:34 could read, “I have testified, ‘This is the Son of God,’” even if an indirect quote is still possible. Ensor acknowledges that in the rest of the cases there is ambiguity “even if the context usually inclines the translator in one direction or another.”

²⁵ Abbott, *Grammar*, 163-64. Daniel B. Wallace (*The Basics of New Testament Syntax: An Intermediate Greek Grammar* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000]) counters this notion directly (but not Abbott specifically) using the example of John 4:17 where the word order is altered in quotation: “Such a change in word order does not turn this into indirect discourse; that would require, in this case, person-concord between the controlling verb (εἶπας) and the embedded verb (ἔχεις would have to be used instead of ἔχω); i.e. ‘Correctly, you have said that you do not have a husband’” (p. 198; see also 302). Wallace’s hypothetical revised phrasing appears in \aleph and D; see below.

The ambiguous cases also contain several instances where a verb other than λέγω is used: John 1:34 and 4:44 use μαρτυρέω (but see also 4:39 where a direct quote is more certain with this verb); 11:51, commenting on the previous verse, uses προφητεύω while 18:14, commenting on the same verse, uses συμβουλεύω.²⁶ In most cases the difference between a direct quote and an indirect one has little impact on the force of the quotation. For example, John 8:48 is universally punctuated as indirect, yet there is little difference between, “Do we not rightly say that you are a Samaritan and you have a demon?” and “Do we not rightly say, ‘You are a Samaritan’ and, ‘You have a demon?’” In fact the latter is an exact quote of what the crowd said in 7:20.²⁷

The former claim though, that Jesus is a Samaritan, is novel. If taken directly, John 8:48 would add to the number of cases of unverifiable DIQ (or of paraphrastic addition). As Abbott points out, the fulfilled word of Jesus in 18:9 is unavoidable due to its formal introduction (and, I would add, the use of the first person “he said, ‘...I lost’,” not “he lost”), but other cases are either heavily paraphrased or entirely absent from the preceding dialogue (1:33-34; 4:44; 6:36; 10:36c; 11:40; 14:2). In the former cases, the extent of variation in John’s quotations argues against using exactness as a criterion for

²⁶ It is extraordinary for συμβουλεύω to introduce direct speech (often being followed by an infinitive verb instead; cf. Rev 3:18) although Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.71.2 may provide an exception, while John may be unique in doing so using ὅτι. The phrasing in Herodotus is: συνεβούλευσε Κροίσῳ τάδε (οὐνομά οἱ ἦν Σάνδανις)· ὃ βασιλεῦ..., “He (whose name was Sandanis) advised Croesus this, ‘O King...’” The τάδε effectively serves the same function as ὅτι (this is made even clearer in those manuscripts which omit the parenthetical identification of the advisor; see P.-E. LeGrand, ed., *Histoires* [9 vols.; 5th ed.; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930-1954], 1:46).

²⁷ The construction that the Jews use here, “Do we not rightly say (οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς ὅτι),” may be compared to the more certainly direct quotation in 4:17, “You rightly said (καλῶς εἶπας ὅτι).” The other similar uses of καλῶς occur in 13:13 and 18:23 but do not refer to the *content* of a specific speech act, only to the *quality* of the speech of the disciples and Jesus, respectively.

determining direct or indirect quotation. In the latter cases, given that John actually has a much lower proportion of unverifiable quotations than the Hebrew Bible literature surveyed by Savran, or in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (see Table 3), it is unclear why the absence of a preceding statement should lead us to interpret a quotation as indirect by default unless we are otherwise forced to accept it as direct. Admittedly the list in Table 1.1 remains a maximalist study of direct internal quotations in the Fourth Gospel. Doing so provides us with a larger sample on which to make empirical observations about how John uses DIQ. However, greater weight has been given to the majority of unambiguous cases while the ambiguous cases serve to supplement these discussions.

DIQ and Text-Critical Issues in the Gospel of John

As was discussed in chapter 3, John's direct internal quotations are more noticeable than those in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts due to their frequency but more importantly due to their *proximity*: few of the quotations in Acts occur even within the same chapter, much less the same verse. It is not quite as striking when the character Paul, for instance, quotes the Lord differently than the narrator when the quotation is given over a dozen chapters later. Mark features some close quotations that are nonetheless inexact (three within one verse of each other), but it avoids certain difficulties posed by John's quotations. What seem to bother commentators on John are 1) *inexact* quotations, 2) generally of something *Jesus* has said, 3) quoted either by Jesus or by the narrator. These factors do not occur in either the Synoptic gospels or Acts, but they account for many of the scribal harmonizations in John.

The discussion of paraphrase in the second chapter was dependent on knowing precisely how the quotations vary from the original statements. This is a concern because there are 19 cases where the variations are at least partially eliminated in the manuscript evidence. Below we will make some observations about each case before drawing some general conclusions. In each case, the NA²⁸ reading will be given along with any variant readings of the quoted statements.

- 1) John 1:20: Ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός.
 John 3:28: Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός
 B: Ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός
 D, W^s, 086, a, aur, ff², j, l, sy^c: Οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός

It is not clear whether to take B as a partial harmonization of the quoted statement or as a modification of the introduction to the quotation. If B imperfectly harmonizes the verses (the post-verbal ἐγὼ is still present), then it would be the most distant case. The additional ἐγὼ stands in the place of ὅτι in other, earlier manuscripts (e.g. both Bodmer papyri) so that it may be attached to “I said” rather than “I am not.” D, W^s, and some early versions lack the pronoun ἐγὼ altogether, which has the effect of turning the paraphrase from a transposition into a subtraction (specifically an abridgement). This has the net effect of a harmonization: the quotation is now accurate if only partial.

The external evidence clearly favors the critical reading: a confused harmonization appears only in B in the fourth century, and partial harmonizations begin to appear rarely in the fifth century. Each has to do with the presence or absence of a pronoun, which can drop easily in transmission as may be the case in the second variant reading. With the first variant in B, it is *possible* that the scribe had the phrasing from

John 1:20 in mind as he copied out the verse, inserting the pronoun before the verb and then picking up a second pronoun from his manuscript as he continued to copy. If so the internal evidence also favors the critical reading. There is a weak possibility of a (sub-conscious?) harmonization in B, and an even weaker possibility of a harmonization in the second variant, although it is more likely that a pronoun was dropped in transmission.

- 2) John 1:27: ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος.
 A, C³, K, N^c, Γ, Δ, Θ, f⁴³, 565, 700, 892, 1424, Koine, Old Latin, sy^(p).h, bo^{mss}: ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος [ὃς absent in Θ]
 John 1:30: Ὁπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.
 John 1:15: Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.

In this case we have an addition that strengthens the connection between John 1:27 and its quotation three verses later in 1:30. If the addition harmonizes, as it seems, then it is an anticipatory modification: the scribes knew what was coming and filled it in appropriately. The manuscript Θ (9th century) instead lacks ὃς, so that the wording of the first seven words matches 1:15 exactly. Here the modification might be retrospective, with the scribe recalling what he just copied from 1:15, or a relative pronoun may have dropped out in copying the text without violating the sense of the sentence.

External evidence favors the critical reading, but not as overwhelmingly as the previous case. The variant reading enters in the fourth or fifth century with A and is replicated fairly widely after that. However, there are a number of earlier witnesses that align with the critical reading, which continues to be a popular option after the fifth century. As far as internal evidence, it is mainly a question of which text the scribes

might be harmonizing with. It would be easy to see how a scribe might want to harmonize with the quotations in either 1:15 or 30, and the fact that one variant reading points to one quotation (1:30) while a second points to the other (1:15) strengthens the argument that this is what happened.

On the other hand, a similar claim appears in the Synoptic Baptist material (see esp. Matt 3:11) where the Fourth Gospel's expression, "who has become ahead of me," is nowhere to be found. Given the amount of textual harmonization between the baptism scenes in general,²⁸ could early scribes have dropped John's expression once they recognized its similarity to Synoptic parallels? This is doubtful. Another phrase intrudes in the Synoptic versions (ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν). There are no signs of this in the manuscript evidence for the Fourth Gospel, i.e. no scribes replaced the Johannine expression with the Synoptic one; instead a broad range of early manuscripts would have apparently only dropped a phrase from John merely because it did not appear in the Synoptics. The internal evidence seems to favor the critical reading, although again not as clearly as the previous case.

In any event, the focus of our analysis above was on the importation of "because he was before me" into the quotations, which shifts the weight toward a temporal comparison, and not so much on the replacement of John's unworthiness to untie Jesus' shoes with a banal statement about Jesus ranking ahead of him. If the variant reading is preferred, then the second clause is retained in quotation but the potentially temporal com-

²⁸ Just within this verse, the Bodmer papyri harmonize John's "worthy" with the Synoptic "fit," and N (6th century) imports "he will baptize you in Holy Spirit and fire" from Matt 3:11.

parison continues to replace the comparison of status. Therefore the above analysis is not greatly altered.

- 3) John 1:48: Πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν εἶδόν σε.
 John 1:50: εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς
 P⁶⁶: εἶδόν σε ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν

In the critical reading, the preposition is changed from ὑπό to ὑποκάτω along with a change of case from accusative to genitive for the fig tree. In only one manuscript the preposition and the case are retained, P⁶⁶. Although the reading is early, it is unique.

Given that the quotation follows only two verses after the original statement, it is quite understandable if the scribe glanced over the relatively rare ὑποκάτω (this is the only case in John)²⁹ and used the simpler, and more popular, ὑπό instead—which he had just copied from 1:48. Notice, however, that the scribe did not harmonize the word order, which is still reversed. The analysis of this verse under the rubric of transposition is unaffected in the unlikely event that P⁶⁶ retains the original reading.

- 4) John 4:17a: Οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα
 κ, C*, D, L, 1241, j, r¹: Ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω
 John 4:17b: Ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω
 κ, D, it, vg^{mss}: Ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχεις

There are two variant, in some cases overlapping traditions that serve to eliminate the transposition between the Samaritan's statement and Jesus' quotation within the same verse. The first tactic simply rearranges the Samaritan's statement to match Jesus' quotation: beginning with the first hand of C, Jesus now quotes accurately because the

²⁹ The preposition occurs only 11 times in the NT, four of them in Revelation which, given the apocalyptic imagery that follows in John 1:51, may be relevant. Meanwhile ὑπό appears over 200 times in the NT, although in John elsewhere only in 14:21.

Samaritan *speaks* accurately.³⁰ The second tactic leaves the Samaritan's statement alone but changes Jesus' quotation into an indirect one: "You have rightly said *that you* don't have a husband." Notably \aleph and D do both: her word order matches his, but Jesus' quotation is still made indirect. On external grounds, the critical reading is stronger. On internal grounds, the variety of solutions can all be traced back to the problem posed by Jesus' paraphrastic but immediate quotation of the woman (only seven words intervene). While it is possible that the scribes who altered the Samaritan's word order recalled Jesus' phrasing and anticipated it unconsciously when writing out her statement, it also seems possible that the transposition itself was problematic and they rearranged the original statement to protect Jesus from "misquoting" her.

- 5) John 4:29: Δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα
 \aleph , B, C*, Or^{pt}: Δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα
 John 4:39: Εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα
 P⁶⁶, A, C³, D, K, N, W^s, Γ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f^{1.13}, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241,
 1424, l 844, l 2211, Koine, Old Latin, sy^h: εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα

The same sort of bi-directional correction happens later in the same chapter. The paraphrase involves a minor substitution in the critical text: ὅσα in 4:29 becomes ἃ in 4:39. One solution, very widespread and beginning as early as P⁶⁶, imports ὅσα into the later verse. The quotation is ten verses later, but it is still possible that the scribe recalled the phrasing he had recently copied, whether unconsciously or assuming that the pronouns should match and his manuscript was defective. The other solution moves in the opposite direction: ἃ is moved into 4:29. The evidence for this tendency is not as widespread in the manuscript evidence, although it is somewhat early (beginning with \aleph).

³⁰ See above, chapter 2 n. 77 for Wallace's comments on this scribal harmonization.

The scribes may have recalled the later verse or the pronoun may simply be pared down in transmission.³¹ However, C gives some evidence of intentional harmonization: in the original hand both pronouns read ἄ, a potentially coincidental mistake. But by the third hand, both pronouns read ὅσα, meaning that if the critical reading is accurate (or at least represents C's original template) then one scribe came through and "fixed" the pronoun in 4:29, and subsequently he or another scribe came through and made the pronouns match again. The critical text has the better manuscript evidence: although P⁶⁶ is early, P⁷⁵ is roughly as old and gives the critical reading which appears more often thereafter. Furthermore, we again have solutions moving in both directions that are difficult to understand if one or the other variant reading is original, but that are easily explained if the critical text is original.

6) John 5:11: Ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει.

John 5:12: Ἄρον καὶ περιπάτει.

A^c, C³, D, K, N, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f^{1.13}, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Koine, latt, sy, sa, pbo, bo: Ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει.

Here we have another quotation that follows closely on the statement (nine words separate them) with a variant reading that harmonizes the two. The variant begins with A^c in the fifth century and is notably widespread. I am nonetheless reluctant to accept it as original. First, the critical reading still has older witnesses that are quite strong (both Bodmer papyri, α, and A*). Second, the omission of "your bed" by accident is possible but unlikely: it never occurs in 5:8 or 5:11 so far as we can see, and the repetition in these passages does not lend itself to skipping over these three words in particular. Meanwhile

³¹ The evidence given by Origen does not seem terribly important, especially since it is only partial. It would seem a rather simple thing for him to mix up the pronouns without the need of a variant manuscript.

going the other way, inserting “your bed” into 5:12, harmonizes a quotation with the original statement. Furthermore, it harmonizes the statement with two verses in the immediate context (5:8 and 5:11), so that the scribe has just copied out “carry your bed” not once but *twice*, and it also harmonizes the statement with one found in Mark! As was noted above (chapter 4 n. 119), there are signs of harmonization between two similar statements—in two very different circumstances—in Luke and Acts, perhaps giving evidence that the phrase itself was memorable. These other scribes may have simply remembered Luke’s phrasing as they copied Acts. Such a possibility is all the more likely here, where the copyist needs only to recall the phrase he just copied moments ago. The variant reading would then ring true, and it is easy to understand how it would be copied by later scribes from then on, working itself into a broad range of Greek manuscripts as well as Latin, Syriac, and Coptic.

- 7) John 6:38: ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
 x, D, K, Γ, Δ, Ψ, *f*¹, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1424, Koine: ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἐκ
 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
 John 6:42 (cp. also 6:41): Ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα

At first glance this would seem to be a case of “back-smoothing,” altering the original statement so that it matches the quotation. If so, it would seem to go against the conclusion drawn by Wallace regarding John 4:17 that scribes altered the Samaritan’s statement rather than Jesus’ quotation to maintain the sanctity of his wording over hers. Instead here the scribes would be altering *Jesus’* wording to match quotations by hostile Jews! The modification is probably not nearly as deliberate as that: ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is a relatively rare wording, especially in John where it occurs only here. Meanwhile ἐκ τοῦ

οὐρανοῦ occurs 12 times in John alone, eight times just in this discourse.³² Internally the substitution appears to be less of a harmonization with the quotation than a harmonization with typical Johannine usage.

- 8) John 7:34: ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσετέ [με]
 John 7:36: ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὐρήσετέ [με]

The problem in this case is over the presence or absence of another pronoun, με, a pronoun dropped elsewhere,³³ and whether it should appear in the statement, the quotation, both or neither. An additional complication arises from the fact that, until the uncial N in the 6th century,³⁴ the manuscripts are remarkably consistent one way or the other: P⁷⁵, B, and T, and 0105 have “me” in both verses, while P⁶⁶, x, D, K, L, W, the Koine and the Latin traditions lack it in both verses. On external grounds, lacking “me” is much stronger: it is just as early as the manuscripts with “me,” but it is more popular and more widespread. However, the object of “find” is frequently omitted in such formulas (e.g. LXX Amos 8:12; Ps 36:10; Prov 1:28-29; 8:17; Lam 1:19). It is possible that the similarity to Prov 1:28-29, “they will seek me but will not find” was noticed by the copyists who then omitted the second “me” in imitation of the earlier text, or simply that omis-

³² ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ or ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ appears in Matt 24:29; Mark 8:11 (changed to ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in Matt 16:1 and ἐξ οὐρανοῦ in Luke 11:16); Luke 9:54; 17:29; 21:11; 22:43; Rom 1:18; 1 Thess. 4:16; 2 Thess. 1:7; and 1 Peter 1:12, a total of ten times in the NT. Meanwhile ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ and ἐξ οὐρανοῦ appear in Matt 16:1; 21:25 (twice); 28:2; Mark 11:30; 13:25; Luke 3:22; 10:18; 11:13, 16; 20:4, 5; Acts 2:2; 9:3; 11:5, 9; 22:6; 1 Cor. 15:47; 2 Cor. 5:2; Gal 1:8; 2 Peter 1:18; and 17 times in Revelation. This phrasing occurs in John 1:32; 3:13, 27, 31; 6:31, 32 (twice), 33, 41, 42, 50, 51, 58; 12:28.

³³ In the previous chapter, see John 6:36 which reads “you have seen *me*” in most mss, but the “me” is dropped in x, A, a, b, e, q, sy^{s.c}.

³⁴ N has με in 7:34 but not in 7:36, creating an omission for the Jews. See also later 565 and the Syriac. While hardly strong evidence for an original reading, it would support a reading given above (chapter 3): Jesus focuses on the christological aspects of the saying (“you will seek *me*, and you will not find *me*”), while the Jews focus on the judicial aspect (“you will investigate me, but you will not succeed”).

sions occurred which aligned with common usage (which is why we do not see omissions of the first “me” in the mss). What is important for our analysis is that, outside of two later manuscripts and the Syriac tradition, *the quotation always matches the statement*. John is commenting on the paraphrase of the Jews through the subtraction of his contextualizing claim that he is going to the one who sent him (7:33), not through the inaccuracy of their quotation of the parts they do cite. This is why throughout my analysis of these verses I have maintained the με in brackets.

9-10) John 8:21: ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν.

John 8:22: Ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν

P⁷⁵, pbo, bo^{pt}: Ὅπου ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν

John 13:33: Ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν

P⁶⁶, W, 579: Ὅπου ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν

Here we have two citations of John 8:21 in very different circumstances, one by the Jews (8:22) and one by Jesus (13:33). In the first case, the pronoun ἐγὼ is omitted in the quotation. It is a rare omission: the early P⁷⁵, the proto-Bohairic, and only sometimes in the Bohairic. That each of these occurs in Egypt is perhaps indicative of a textual tradition, but not a strong or consistent one. It seems just as likely that the pronoun is occasionally dropped in transmission without violating the sense of the statement. The fact that the same omission occurs five chapters later in 13:33 in a completely different set of texts seems to reaffirm that hypothesis: P⁶⁶ is again early and Egyptian, although it has the pronoun in 8:22. W has the variant, and not again until a 13th century minuscule 579. This does not indicate so much a tradition as a series of similar mistakes. For either variant reading, the external evidence is quite weak. Internally, it is unclear what would be accomplished by omitting the pronoun (lack of emphasis on *Jesus* going?), whereas it

is easy to understand how a syntactically unnecessary pronoun would be dropped in transmission. The critical text is not terribly threatened by these variant readings.

11) John 8:51: ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

κ, Γ, 1: θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

P⁶⁶: θάνατον οὐ μὴ ἰδῇ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

John 8:52: Ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσῃ, οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

P⁶⁶, (D), L: μου τὸν λόγον

33 [9th C]: τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον

There are a few variants here to note. First, in 8:51 the tense and verb for “see” varies in the mss. However, since the issues in the Jews’ paraphrase involve word order and the change from “see” to “taste,” a change that is still maintained in these manuscripts, these variants do not impact the discussion above. The variants of 8:52, however, do. P⁶⁶ followed by (D) and L, moves μου before τὸν λόγον. If the copyist was influenced by the earlier placement of ἐμὸν in 8:51 then we might have a harmonization. Yet the copyist would be particularly lax in doing so: the case of “my” is not harmonized and although it is moved earlier, it is not moved *to the same place*. The only real harmonization occurs in the 9th century minuscule 33. It may just as well have happened because of the quick repetition as a conscious desire to harmonize the quotation with the statement, but either way it is not likely to be the original reading.

12) John 8:41: ἓνα πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Θεόν.

John 8:54: Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστίν

P^{66*}, κ, B*, D, Ψ, 700, 1424, it, vg^{cl}, bo^{ms}: Θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν

I have already addressed this verse briefly above (chapter 4 n. 214): while some of the witnesses for the variant reading are quite early, those for the critical reading are just as early and more widespread. Brown sides with the direct quotation (“he is our God”)

arguing that it is “less polished and thus more original.”³⁵ It is possible that copyists heard the echoes of the *Shema* I argue for above and changed the pronoun accordingly, but it is more likely that they noticed how paraphrastic Jesus’ quotation was and moved it into indirect speech to avoid having him misrepresent his opponents. Additionally, a simple mistake on the pronoun still gives a viable reading, so there would be little pressure to check the mistake.

13) John 9:7: Ὑπαγε νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ (ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται Ἀπεσταλμένος)

John 9:11: Ὑπαγε εἰς τὸν Σιλωάμ καὶ νίψαι

A, K, N, Γ, Δ, Ψ, *f*⁴³, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1424, *l* 844, *l* 2211, Koine, Old Latin, sy^{(s.p).h}, sa^{ms}: Ὑπαγε εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ καὶ νίψαι

Here a number of manuscripts significantly (but incompletely) harmonize where the blind man is meant to go, importing “the pool of” from 9:7 into 9:11. This forces the copyist to change the case of Siloam (although not its spelling) from accusative to genitive. The variant reading is relatively early, beginning with A, and widespread. If it were original, the variant would undermine the comments made above about the neighbors not needing to hear that it was a pool (after all they should know it was). In this sense alone may the variant be considered the more difficult reading. However, the bulk of my comments on this verse appeared in the context of transposition, and interestingly the copyists *did not harmonize the word order*. They merely substitute τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ for τὸν.

³⁵ *John*, 1:359.

- 14) John 9:21: αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, ἡλικίαν ἔχει
 A, K, N, Γ, Δ, *f*¹³, 565, 700, 892, (1241), 1424, Koine, q, (l), sy^{(s.p.)h}: αὐτὸς
 ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε αὐτὸς
l 844, *l* 2211: ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε αὐτὸς
- John 9:23: Ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσατε
 P⁶⁶, A: Ἡλικίαν ἔχει, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε
 K, L, N, Γ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, *f*^{1.13}, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, *l* 844, *l* 2211,
 Koine: Ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε
 D: ἐρωτάτε

There are two forms of paraphrase in the critical text: a transposition and a substitution of one verb (ἐρωτάω) with a prefixed form of the same verb (ἐπερωτάω). Both paraphrases are eliminated in different ways in the variants, but first one reading can be eliminated from consideration since it is unique and probably the result of a copying mistake. D gives the present imperative ἐρωτάτε rather than an aorist imperative, which appears in all other manuscripts. The copyist likely omitted –ησ- and landed on a grammatically viable alternative. However, it is also more likely that D intended a form of ἐρωτάω, so it should be considered in that group.

However other manuscripts transpose the two clauses, which would harmonize the statement and its quotation at least as far as the words quoted. Not only that, in most of these cases (except q, (l), and the Syriac), the verb in 9:23 is also harmonized by dropping the prefix. The same reading in 9:23 is given in other manuscripts (Θ, Ψ, *f*¹, 33, and 579), although these do not harmonize the word order. In still another variant of 9:23, early but rare, an additional “and” is introduced. In P⁶⁶, this effectively eliminates the conflict in word order since the quotation can now be read as a double quotation: “For this reason his parents said, ‘He is of age,’ and ‘Ask him’.” The presence of “and” in A is curious since it has already harmonized both verbs and the word order.

Although it was not a terribly important point, our focus was on the transposition of clauses, arguing that the new order foregrounds the man's legal status as a witness and ending with "ask him" leads into the next verse. The two earliest manuscripts (the Bodmer papyri) have the transposed word order, with P⁶⁶ making a minor alteration to address the issue. The transposition is not undone until K in the 9th century when it becomes widespread. The matching word order is unlikely to be original.

- 15) John 16:10: πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω
 John 16:17: ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα
 Ψ, 33: πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω

Although there is a transposition in the critical text, the quotation is harmonized in two manuscripts. Since the harmonization does not appear until the 9th century, it is unlikely to be original. The phrase, "because I go to the Father" as it appears in 16:17 also appears in a wide variety of manuscripts in 16:16 (A, K, N, Γ, Δ, Θ, 068, *f*^{1.13}, 565, 579, 700, 892^s, 1424, / 844, Koine, lat, sy, pbo, bo^{pt}). If original, the quotation in 16:17 matches 16:16 precisely instead of drawing in elements of 16:16 and 16:10. If it is not original, the copyists may have seen the lengthy quotation from 16:16 and assumed the rest had been accidentally omitted. They were not necessarily correct and their amendment appears to be a bit of back-smoothing.

- 16) John 16:14: ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.
 John 16:15: ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν
 P⁶⁶ and 8*: Omit the whole verse.

In the critical text there is a substitution of tense in the verb: John 16:14 says the Paraclete *will* receive while 16:15 says he *does* receive. Two manuscripts omit the whole verse, probably as Brown notes through homoioteleuton (both variants end in καὶ

ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν).³⁶ Brown also notes witnesses that have a future in 16:15, “harmonizing with [verse] 14.” He does not list the manuscripts, nor are they listed in NA²⁸, suggesting that they are not among the major witnesses to John. The omission is probably accidental but would coincidentally eliminate the paraphrase. The modification of the verb in the manuscripts Brown notes is perhaps also accidental—only 11 words separate the statements—but may also point to a purposeful harmonization.

17-18) John 16:16: Μικρὸν καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με.
A, K, Γ, Δ, f⁴³, 565, 579, 700, 892^s, 1241, 1424, Koine, a, de, e, sy^{s,p}:

Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με;

John 16:17: Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με
D, W, Ψ, 33: Μικρὸν καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με

John 16:19: Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με

Θ, 565: Μικρὸν καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με

These verses are generally a mess in the manuscripts with a variety of variant readings throughout. Harmonizations of the adverbs οὐκέτι and οὐ appear in both directions. The majority of manuscripts eliminate “no longer” altogether, so that “not” appears throughout. If this is not original, it is a case of back-smoothing. A smaller set put “no longer” in the quotations, harmonizing the quotation with the original statement. Interestingly no manuscripts ‘correct’ both quotations: some match the adverbs in 16:16 and 17, which may be accidental, while others match the adverbs in 16:16 and 19, which also may be accidental or it may be an attempt to harmonize Jesus’ quotation with his own statement. The critical text is earlier and still widespread. The variants all harmonize the quotations

³⁶ Brown, *John*, 2:709.

but in a variety of ways, suggesting that the mismatched adverbs were problematic and led to different solutions.

- 19) John 17:12: ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι
 ⲥ²: ὁ δέδωκάς
 C³, N: οὖς ἔδωκας
 A, D, K, Γ, Δ, Ψ, f^{1.13}, 565^s, 700, 1241, 1424, l 844, Koine, lat, sy^{p.h}: οὖς
 δέδωκάς
 C*, 579: ᾧ ἔδωκας
 P⁶⁶, ⲥ*: Omitted
 John 18:9: Οὖς δέδωκάς μοι, οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα.
 P⁶⁶, D, Θ: οὖς ἔδωκας

The connection between John 17:12 and 18:9 can be seen in some of the harmonizations evident in the manuscripts, although not all of the variants harmonize. In 17:12, C, N, and 579 drop the first letter from δέδωκάς, rendering a perfect verb into an aorist. P⁶⁶, D, and Θ do the same in 18:9. None of the manuscripts drop the δ in both verses, so whatever is going on with the verb it is not harmonization. The entire prayer in John 17 is filled with δίδωμι in the aorist (four other times) and in the perfect (11 other times) with similar problems in manuscripts: NA²⁸ gives the aorist in 17:6 and 8 but the perfect is found in manuscripts beginning with C in the former case, with ⲥ in the latter. More relevant, NA²⁸ gives the perfect in 17:7, 22 (twice), 24, and 17:11, just before the case in question, all with witnesses to the aorist. The variants here do not seem significant to the present study, especially since the two verses seem to be variations on a theme and 18:9 is probably an unverifiable quotation.

There are a number of other variants regarding the pronouns preceding “you have given me.” The critical text gives the dative neuter singular which appears in P^{66c} vid, B, L, W, 33, and co. The critical reading (along with C* and 579) regards the gift as the

name: “I have kept them in your name *which* you have given me” (cp. John 5:43; 10:25; 12:13; 17:6, 26 for other associations of Jesus with the Father’s name). Meanwhile a large group of variants gives instead an accusative masculine plural pronoun, so that the gift is the disciples: “I have kept *them* in your name *whom* you have given me.” The previous verse, John 17:11, is no help since the same problems attend the pronoun there: Jesus asks the Holy Father to keep them in his name *which* or *whom* he has given Jesus.

All of this makes it very difficult to weigh in one way or the other. We may wish to consider which other passage the variant causes 17:12 to harmonize with. Let us consider several points:

- The pronoun does not vary in 18:9: it always appears as οὓς even when the verb differs. Although the verbs often match, D has matching pronouns without matching the tense of the verbs.
- P^{66c} vid^l, B, C*, L, W, 33, 579, and co have the dative singular in 17:12. L, W, and 579 also have the dative singular in 17:11.
- A, C³, D, K, N, Γ, Δ, Ψ, f^{1.13}, 565^s, 700, 1241, 1424, l 844, Koine, lat, sy^{p.h} have the accusative plural in 17:12. Of these, D¹, N, and the Vulgate also have the accusative plural in 17:11. However, we should notice that at least one manuscript, C, moves from the dative singular in 17:12 to the accusative plural. In other words, C initially matches 17:11, the closer verse, and *is corrected later* to

match 18:9. No manuscripts move in the opposite direction,³⁷ i.e. from a match with 18:9 to a match with 17:11.

In both cases similarity to 17:11 is weaker than to 18:9. In other words, if harmonization is occurring here then the strong fulfillment language of 18:9 would seem to be a greater motivation to align the pronouns than the proximity of 17:11, whatever the original reading was. The case of C gives weak evidence that the tradition moved in the direction of matching 18:9 against 17:11. If this is the case and 17:12 originally read with the dative singular, then at 23 verses apart it would be an exceptionally distant case of back-smoothing.

So what can we conclude about scribal tendencies regarding paraphrased quotations? First, variant readings that harmonize the quotation and the original speech act are more plentiful the later the manuscript. Once a harmonized reading enters the textual history of a verse, it very rarely returns to a paraphrased reading. Which statement to change, the original or the quotation, is inconsistent and we saw several cases where both solutions appear. Only one case moves away from harmonization (the quotations of 8:21 in 8:22 and 13:33), and there it is only due to the probably accidental omission of a pronoun. In fact, the variants we have examined involve pronouns in seven cases rather than more substantial nouns and verbs.³⁸

³⁷ The corrected reading in P⁶⁶ is uncertain but seems to give the dative singular. The original reading omits the phrase altogether, which does avoid a perceived disharmony with 18:9 if one were felt but at the expense of the present verse. An accidental omission due to the similarity with 17:11 (which seems to have the dative singular in P⁶⁶, but is also uncertain) is more likely.

³⁸ Also, two more cases involve choice of preposition, and two more the choice of adverb (οὐ or οὐκέτι). That is, more than half of the cases involve minor alterations to less substantial words.

Second, proximity seems to be an important factor in predicting whether scribes will harmonize quotations. Of the 19 cases eliminating inexact quotations, one occurs in the same verse (4:17), and another 11 occur within five verses of the original statement. Third and finally, lexical similarity (if not exactness) seems to prompt harmonizations. For example, there is no manuscript evidence that copyists modified the Jews' heavily paraphrased quotation of Jesus in 8:33, just 14 words after his statement in 8:31-32, or Jesus' heavily paraphrased quotation of the Pharisees in 9:41 just 15 words after their statement in 9:40, despite their proximity. When the quotations are radically different from the original speech act (and perhaps when they are between Jesus and his opponents), there seems to be little pressure or tendency to align the one with the other. However, if the phrasing is quite close, especially if it differs only with regard to the placement or form of a pronoun, the two statements are more likely to be harmonized. In any event, we have focused on cases where the manuscript evidence is clear or at least not very muddled.

The Problem of John 14:2

Now we will turn to a problematic case that potentially contains an unverifiable quotation but which presents both textual and grammatical problems that I have largely avoided up to now. John 14:2 has particular significance for our discussion of realized and final eschatologies, so it will be useful to reach some sort of conclusion on how the verse should read even if that conclusion is tentative due to the confused nature of the evidence. First the verse as presented in NA²⁸:

John 14:2: ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου μοναὶ πολλάί εἰσιν· εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν ὅτι πορεύομαι ἐτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν;

The *content* of the verse is addressed in more detail above (see chapter 5), but here we have to address two questions. The first is the text-critical question of what should actually be read in John 14:2. The second is the syntactical question of how the verse should be read once a text has been chosen.

Text-critically, the principal issue related to DIQ is whether the ὅτι should be read or not.³⁹ A quote is possible either way, but without the ὅτι a full stop is possible after εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν so that the statement could read: “Otherwise I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.”⁴⁰ P⁶⁶ is corrected to include it, but P⁶⁶ has an affinity for ὅτι. The second hand of C omits it, as do several later manuscripts beginning in the 6th century.⁴¹ However, it is easy for particles to drop out in transmission,⁴² and the omission may have made more sense to the copyist. The sheer amount of difficulty posed by the reading with ὅτι, as demonstrated in modern commentaries, suggests that a reading

³⁹ These are not the only variants in the verse. P⁶⁶ alone has the variant spellings ὑμειν and πορευομε, as well as a variant word order: αν precedes ειπον in the original reading, but is corrected; ὑμειν precedes τοπον and is not corrected. Furthermore, there is a widely attested patristic variant of 14:2a that reads πολλὰι μοναὶ παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ. Boismard (“Critique textuelle et citations patristiques,” *RB* 57 [1950]: 388-408, here 390) considers this the original reading due only to its simplicity, despite the fact that he finds no manuscript evidence to support this contention and seven of the 41 patristic witnesses agree with the manuscripts (to which we might add at least partially Ps.-Justin 9:3, 8, and the *Martyrdom of Montanus and Lucius* 15:17). Boismard does not seem to notice that the correspondence with John 14:23 (μονὴν παρ’ αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα), which he notes, also provides a source for the conflation.

⁴⁰ Such is essentially Brown’s solution (*John*, 2:619-20). Without the particle, “Otherwise I would have told you, ‘I go to prepare a place for you’” is still possible (cf. 3:7; 7:36; 15:20; 21:17 for similar constructions without ὅτι and beginning with a verb, and 10:36c for a similar construction in the first person singular throughout).

⁴¹ N is followed by Γ, Δ, and Θ from the 9th or 10th centuries as well as some later minuscules and the Koine text type.

⁴² Trent A. Rogers, “A Syntactical Analysis of οὖν in Papyrus 66,” *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 25 (2012): 75-99, esp. 76 n. 4.

without it would have been attractive. For example Brown, who usually sides both with the more difficult reading and with the Bodmer papyri, omits the particle here only because “the translation without *hoti* makes the best sense.”⁴³ Meanwhile the particle is included in the corrected P⁶⁶ (possibly due only to an accidental omission in the original) as well as **Ⲑ**, A, B, D and a number of other early manuscripts.⁴⁴ So the reading with the particle is better attested externally, the omission of the particle is a common occurrence which makes its absence easy to explain, and the omission results in an easier reading. All of this recommends taking the **ὅτι** as present in the original.

How to interpret the sentence(s) even with the particle is not entirely clear. Brown gives four options depending on whether a question or a statement is being made, and whether **ὅτι** is causal or marks speech:⁴⁵

- (a) Otherwise I would have told you, because I go to prepare a place for you.
- (b) Otherwise would I have told you so, because I go to prepare a place for you?
- (c) Otherwise I would have told you that I go to prepare a place for you.
- (d) Otherwise would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you?⁴⁶

Brown ignores the possibility of a direct quote (“Otherwise would I have told you, ‘I go to prepare a place for you?’”), most likely since it is not forced through a combination of persons. There is nothing preventing it, but either way it is little different from (c) and (d)

⁴³ Brown, *John*, 2:620.

⁴⁴ These include K, L, W, Ψ, the Lake and Ferrar groups, multiple minuscules dating as early as the 9th century, and the Vulgate (*vobis quia*).

⁴⁵ Brown, *John*, 2:619.

⁴⁶ Similar to this reading, Noack (*Tradition*, 148) suggests that an additional **μή** may have originally preceded **εἶπον** but fell out due to haplography, giving the even stronger citation: “Otherwise I would not have told you, ‘I go to prepare a place for you,’ would I?” There is no manuscript support for Noack’s reading, and it is not clear what advantage it would provide other than heightening the force of Jesus’ self-citation.

since Jesus has never been quoted in John as saying anything whatsoever about going to prepare a place.

Grammatically there is little to commend one translation over another. However, we might observe the tendencies in evidence elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel to determine the more likely interpretation: after λέγω, the NA²⁸ edition of John uses ὅτι to mark (direct or indirect) speech 46 other times.⁴⁷ In 18 cases a direct object in the dative intervenes between the verb and the particle as it does here, so this specific construction is quite common in John. One cannot say as much for the causal ὅτι. While John has a tendency to remark upon the impact of speech—what happens *because* something was said—he rarely comments on what caused a speech act using ὅτι.⁴⁸ The one clear case, John 10:36, only presents a speech act caused by yet another speech act: “do you say, ‘You blaspheme,’ *because* I said, ‘I am the Son of God’?” Above (see chapter 4) I have tentatively advocated for a (possible) reading of 1:15, 30 that would indicate the cause of a speech act: “This is the one of whom I said, ‘The one coming after me ranks ahead of me,’ [which I said] *because* he existed before me.” I have found no evidence of a modern scholar reading the two verses this way though. So to read the particle causally in 14:2

⁴⁷ John 1:32; 3:11, 28; 4:17, 20, 35, 42, 51, 52; 5:24, 25; 6:14, 36, 42, 65; 7:12, 42; 8:24, 33, 34, 48, 54, 55; 9:9 (2x), 11, 17, 19, 23, 41; 10:7, 36, 41; 11:40; 12:34; 13:11, 21, 33; 16:15, 20, 26; 18:8, 9, 37; 20:13; 21:23. These include double amen sayings marked with ὅτι, but do not include speech marked with ὅτι following other verbs like ὁμολογέω, ἀναγγέλλω, προφητεύω, συμβουλεύω, ἀγγέλλω, and μαρτυρέω (four times), or the word that is true in 4:37, marked by ὅτι. There are also ten cases where speech that was *heard* is marked with the particle. Additionally with λέγω, there are other cases where ὅτι is taken as causal or playing some other role, but positioned in a way that would allow it to mark speech even if we conclude that it should not from the context: on 16:17, see above; the question in 9:17 could be read, “What do you say about him, *that* (ὅτι) he opened your eyes?”

⁴⁸ Instead ἵνα can be used, as it is in John 13:19: “I am telling you now before it happens, *so that* (ἵνα) when it happens you might believe that I am,” or διὰ τοῦτο as in 6:65, “*For this reason* I have told you, ‘No one can come to me...’”

would impose a construction rarely used in John *if ever*, while reading it as marking speech would add one more case of this construction to nearly four dozen others. We cannot expect absolute consistency from the Fourth Gospel when unique constructions appear elsewhere, but the text's tendencies side with the particle marking speech.

The final question to be addressed is whether the sentence should be read as a statement or as a question. If 14:2 is read as a statement, then Jesus seems to contradict himself:

- 1) My Father's house has many dwelling places.
- 2) If it did not, I would have told you that I go to prepare a place for you.
- 3) If (or when) I go to prepare a place for you, I am coming again.

In such reading, Jesus places in opposition the idea that his Father's house has many dwelling places and that he would go to prepare a place for them—then he tells them that he is going to prepare a place for them, logically negating the idea that his Father's house has many dwelling places. Instead, it is probably the case that his Father's house has many dwelling places *and* that he is going to prepare a place for them, an understanding allowed by reading 14:2b as a question, and that he explains in a sequential manner what he will do after preparing the place for them (he will come again).

Meanwhile, the only problem with reading 14:2 as a question is the implication that Jesus told the disciples at some point that he is going to prepare a place for them. The fact that John does not narrate such a scene (at least not clearly) has been reason enough

for many commentators to choose a different reading.⁴⁹ As this study has shown, however, that is not much of an argument generally, much less in the Fourth Gospel which contains a smaller proportion of unverifiable quotations than we find in other comparable literature. To be disturbed by the lack of an antecedent narrative to 14:2 is to assume a completeness to John's narrative that is not claimed by the text. In fact, the Fourth Gospel admits on two occasions that it has not presented everything there is to know about Jesus (20:30-31; 21:25). In the story world of John, it would only be important that the disciples recognize that Jesus has said something like this before in order for it to be rhetorically effective. Since they express no confusion or misunderstanding (in a scene replete with such interruptions, see 13:36-38; 14:5, 8, 22), we may suppose that they at least are portrayed as knowing to what he is referring. Since in its first century context there is little difficulty posed by an unverifiable quotation, reading 14:2 as a question—"There are many dwelling places in my Father's household. If there weren't, would I have told you, 'I go to prepare a place for you'?"—makes the best sense and aligns with John's method of argumentation.

⁴⁹ See above chapter 5 n. 94.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Edwin A. *Johannine Grammar*. London: A.&C. Black, 1906.
- Abramowski, Luise. "Der Apostel von Johannes 13,16." *ZNW* 99/1 (2008): 116-23.
- Achard, Guy, editor and translator. *Rhétorique à Herennius*. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1989.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Oti Recitativum in Septuagintal Greek." Pages 74-82 in *Studien zur Septuaginta—Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*. Edited by D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers. MSU XX. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Albright, W.F. and C.S. Mann. *Matthew*. AB 26. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981
- Anderson, Janice C. *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again*. JSNTSup 91, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Anderson, Paul N. "John and Mark: The Bi-Optic Gospels." Pages 175-88 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Arens, Eduardo. *The H1ΘON-Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-Critical Investigation*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.
- Asiedu-Peprah, Martin. *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts as Juridicial Controversy*. WUNT 2.132. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Attridge, Harold W. "From Discord Rises Meaning: Resurrection Motifs in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 1-19 in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Edited by R. Bieringer and C.R. Koester. WUNT 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008.
- Aune, David E. *The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity*. NovTSup 28. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. "Sources and Method of the Fourth Evangelist." *HJ* 25 (1926): 115-30.
- . *The Gospel of the Hellenists*. New York: Henry Holt, 1933.

- Ball, David M. *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications*. JSNTSup 124. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Barker, James W. "Written Gospel or Oral Tradition? Patristic Parallels to John 3:3, 5." *EC* 6 (2015): 543-58.
- Baron, Lori. "Interpreting the *Shema*: Liturgy and Identity in the Fourth Gospel." *ASE* 27/2 (2010): 53-60.
- Barrett, C.K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd edition. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- Bartholomä, Philipp F. *The Johannine Discourses and the Teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics*. TANZ 57. Tübingen: Francke, 2012.
- Bascom, Robert A. "Preparing the Way: Midrash in the Bible." Pages 221-47 in *Issues in Bible Translation*. Edited by P.C. Stine. UBSMS 3. London: UBS, 1988.
- Bassler, Jouette M. "Mixed Signals: Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 108/4 (1989): 635-46.
- Bates, Matthew W. *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2012.
- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Adaptation of the Fourth Revised and Augmented Edition of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. 2nd revised edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Baum, Armin D. "Hat Lukas Jesus und die Apostel genau zitiert? Die *oratio recta* im lukanischen Werk zwischen antiker Profan- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung." Pages 105-45 in *Geschichte Israels*. Edited by G. Maier. TVGMS 415. Brockhaus: Wuppertal, 1996.
- . "Zu Funktion und Authentizitätsanspruch der *oratio recta*: Hebräische und griechische Geschichtsschreibung im Vergleich." *ZAW* 115 (2003): 586-607.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. "John 3.3, 5: Baptism, Spirit and the Kingdom." *ExpT* 97/6 (1986): 167-70.
- Becker, Jürgen. "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu im Johannesevangelium." *ZNW* 61 (1970): 215-46.

- . *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. OTNT 4/1. 2 volumes. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verl.-Haus Mohn, 1991.
- Bekken, Per Jarle. *The Lawsuit Motif in John's Gospel from New Perspectives: Jesus Christ, Crucified Criminal and Emperor of the World*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Bennema, Cornelis. "Mimesis in John 13: Cloning or Creative Articulation?" *NovT* 56 (2014): 261-74.
- Benyowitz, Allan R., editor and translator. *Translation of Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch*. 3 volumes. Jerusalem: A.R. Benyowitz, 2006.
- Berger, Klaus. *Die Griechische Daniel-Dieges: Eine altkirchliche Apokalypse*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Bers, Victor. *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Beutler, Johannes. *Habt keine Angst: Die erste johanneische Abschiedsrede (Joh 14)*. Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien 116. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984.
- . "Synoptic Jesus Tradition in the Johannine Farewell Discourse." Pages 165-73 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Bickerman, E.J. "Utilitas Crucis." Pages 726-93 in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. AJEC 68/2. 3 volumes. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Bieringer, Reimund. "Traditionsgeschichtlicher Ursprung und theologische Bedeutung der hyper-Aussagen im Neuen Testament," Pages 1:219-48 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck. 3 volumes. Louvain: Peeters, 1992.
- Bird, Michael F. "The Crucifixion of Jesus as the Fulfillment of Mark 9:1." *TrinJ* 24/1 (2003): 23-36.
- Blank, Josef. *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie*. Freiburg: Lambertus, 1964.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blyth, Dougal. "Socrates' Trial and Conviction of the Jurors in Plato's *Apology*." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 33/1 (2000): 1-22.

Bock, Darrell L. *Jesus According to Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Boismard, M.-E. "Critique textuelle et citations patristiques." *RB* 57 (1950): 388-408.

----. "L'évolution du thème eschatologique dans les traditions johanniques." *RB* 68/4 (1961): 507-24.

----. "Le lavement des pieds (Jn 13:1-17)." *RB* 71/1 (1964): 5-24.

----. "Un procédé rédactionnel dans le quatrième évangile: La *Wiederaufnahme*." Pages 235-41 in *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge. BETL 44. Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1978.

Borgen, Peder. "Observations on the Midrashic Character of John 6." *ZNW* 54 (1963): 232-40.

----. *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.

----. "Logos Was the True Light: Contributions to the Interpretation of the Prologue of John." Pages 95-110 in *Logos Was the True Light and Other Essays on the Gospel of John*. Relieff 9. Trondheim: Tapir, 1983.

----. "The Scriptures and the Words and Works of Jesus." Pages 39-58 in *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies*. Edited by T. Thatcher. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007.

Botha, Eugene. "Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation." *Neotestamentica* 41/2 (2007): 274-94.

Bowman, John. "Samaritan Studies I." *BJRL* 40 (1957): 298-308.

Boxall, Ian. "From Apocalypse of John to the Johannine 'Apocalypse in Reverse': Apocalyptic and the Quest for a Relationship." Pages 58-78 in *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic*. Edited by C.W. Williams and C. Rowland. London: T&T Clark, 2013.

Brankaer, Johanna. "Les citations internes dans le quatrième évangile: un miroir déformant?" Pages 129-56 in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by G. Van Belle, M. Labahn, and P. Maritz. BETL 223. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009.

- Brant, Jo-Ann. "Divine Birth and Apparent Parents: The Plot of the Fourth Gospel." Pages 199-217 in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*. Edited by R.F. Hock, J.B. Chance, and J. Perkins. SBL Symposium Series 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- . *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Brickhouse, Thomas C. and Nicholas D. Smith. *Socrates on Trial*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Bridges, Linda M. "Aphorisms of Jesus in John: An Illustrative Look at John 4.35." *JSHP* 9/2 (2011): 207-29.
- Broadhead, Edwin K. "The Fourth Gospel and the Synoptic Sayings Source: The Relationship Reconsidered." Pages 291-301 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Broer, Ingo. "Auferstehung und ewiges Leben im Johannesevangelium." Pages 67-94 in *"Auf Hoffnung hin sind wir erlöst" (Röm 8,24): Biblische und systematische Beiträge zum Erlösungsverständnis heute*. SBS 128. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987.
- Bromboszcz, Teofil. *Die Einheit des Johannesevangeliums*. Katowice, 1927.
- Brookins, Timothy A. "Luke's Use of Mark as παράφρασις: Its Effects on Characterization in the 'Healing of Blind Bartimaeus' Pericope (Mark 10.46-52/Luke 18.35-43)." *JSNT* 34/1 (2011): 70-89.
- Brouwer, Wayne. *The Literary Development of John 13-17: A Chiastic Reading*. SBLDS 182. Atlanta: SBL, 1999.
- Brower, Kent. "Mark 9:1: Seeing the Kingdom in Power." *JSNT* 2/6 (1979): 17-41.
- Brown, Raymond E. "Incidents that Are Units in the Synoptic Gospels but Dispersed in St. John." *CBQ* 23/2 (1961): 143-60.
- . *The Gospel According to John: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB 29-29A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bruce, F.F. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bryan, Steven M. "The Eschatological Temple in John 14." *BBR* 15/2 (2005): 187-98.

- Bullard, Roger A. "Apocalypse of Peter (VII, 3)." Pages 340-45 in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. Edited by J.M. Robinson. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by K. Grobel. 2 volumes. New York: Scribner, 1965.
- . *The Gospel of John*. Edited and translated by G.R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Bynum, Caroline W. "The Body of Christ in the Later Middle Ages." *Renaissance Quarterly* 39/3 (1986): 399-439.
- Caba, José. "From Lukan Parenthesis to Johannine Christology: Luke 9:23-24 and John 12:25-26." Pages 48-71, 21-25 in *Luke and Acts*. Edited by G. O'Collins, G. Marconi, M.J. O'Connell, and E. Rasco. New York: Paulist, 1992.
- Cacitti, Remo. *Grande Sabato: Il contest pasquale quartodecimano nella formazione della teologia del martirio*. Studia Patristica Medolanensia 19. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1994.
- Cadbury, Henry J. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts IV. On Direct Quotation, with Some Uses of ὅτι and εἰ." *JBL* 48 (1929): 412-25.
- Carson, D.A. "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11." *JBL* 98/4 (1979): 547-66.
- . "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel." *Tyndale Bulletin* 33 (1982): 59-91.
- . *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Chang, Peter S.-C. *Repetitions and Variations in the Gospel of John*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Strasbourg, 1975.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The Book of Exodus*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.
- Classen, Joachim. *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Coby, Patrick. *Socrates and the Sophistic Enlightenment: A Commentary on Plato's Protagoras*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1987.
- Coloe, Mary L. *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2001.
- . "Welcome to the Household of God: The Foot Washing in John 13." *CBQ* 66/3 (2004): 400-15.

- . *Dwelling in the Household of God: Johannine Ecclesiology and Spirituality*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2007.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by G. Buswell. London: Faber & Faber, 1960.
- Cook, W. Robert. "Eschatology in John's Gospel." *Criswell Theological Review* 3 (1988): 79-99.
- Cory, Catherine. "Wisdom's Rescue: A New Reading of the Tabernacles Discourse (John 7:1-8:59)." *JBL* 116/1 (1997): 95-116.
- Coulot, Claude. "Si quelqu'un me sert, qu'il me suive!" (Jean 12,26a)." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 69/1 (1995): 47-57.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Prophetic Conflict*. BZAW 124 New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.
- Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1983.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*. Revised edition. Translated by F.V. Filson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- . "The 'Amen, Amen' Sayings in the Gospel of John." Pages 57-101 in *Perspectives on John: Method and Interpretation in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by R.B. Sloan and M.C. Parsons. Lewiston: Mellen, 1993.
- . "The Origin of the 'Amen, Amen' Sayings in the Gospel of John." Pages 253-62 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- . "Realized Eschatology in the Experience of the Johannine Community." Pages 253-76 in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Edited by R. Bieringer and C.R. Koester. WUNT 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008.
- Daise, Michael A. "Ritual Transference and Johannine Identity." *ASE* 27/2 (2010): 45-51.

- DeConick, April. *Voices of the Mystics: Early Christian Discourse in the Gospels of John and Thomas and Other Ancient Christian Literature*. JSNTSup 157. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004.
- Denyer, Nicholas, editor. *Protagoras*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Derrett, Duncan. "Why 'Bed'? (Mark 2.9d; John 5.8b)." *Bibbia e Oriente* 38/2 (1996): 111-16.
- . "Oriental Sources for John 8,32-36?" *Bibbia e Oriente* 43/1 (2001): 29-32.
- Desbordes, Françoise. "Le schéma 'addition, soustraction, mutation, métathèse' dans les textes anciens." *Histoire Épistémologie Langage* 5/1 (1983): 23-30.
- Destro, Adriana and Mauro Pesce. *Come nasce una religione: Antropologia ed esegesi del Vangelo di Giovanni*. PEL 8. Rome: GLF editori Laterza, 2000.
- . "Il profetismo e la nascita di una religione: Il caso del giovannismo." Pages 87-106 in *Carisma profetico, fattore di innovazione religiosa*. Edited by G. Filoramo. Brescia: Morcelliana, 2003.
- . "Continuity or Discontinuity between Jesus and Groups of His Followers? Practices of Contact with the Supernatural." *ASE* 24/2 (2007): 37-58.
- . "Gesù, le città e i villaggi. Le città guardate dalla periferia." *ASE* 27/1 (2010): 233-54.
- Dik, Helma. *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Dodd, C.H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- . *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Dorjahn, Alfred P. "Intimidation in Athenian Courts." *Classical Philology* 32/4 (1937): 341-48.
- Draper, Jonathan. "Temple, Tabernacle and Mystical Experience in John." *Neot* 31/2 (1997): 263-88.
- . "The 'Theatre of Performance' and 'The Living Word' of Jesus in the Farewell Discourse(s) in John's Gospel." *JECH* 4/1 (2014): 26-43.

- Duke, Paul D. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.
- Dunderberg, Ismo. "Johannine Anomalies and the Synoptics." Pages 108-25 in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives*. Edited by J. Nissen and S. Pedersen. JSNTSup 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Edward, William A., editor and translator. *Seneca the Elder: Suasoriae*. Newburyport: Bristol Classical Press, 1996.
- Ehrman, Bart and Zlatko Pleše, *The Apocryphal Gospels: Texts and Translations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Ellis, Peter F. *The Genius of John: A Composition-Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1984.
- . "Inclusion, Chiasm, and the Division of the Fourth Gospel." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 43/3-4 (1999): 269-338.
- Ensor, Peter W. *Jesus and His 'Works': The Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective*. WUNT 2.85. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- . "The Johannine Sayings of Jesus and the Question of Authenticity." Pages 14-33 in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*. Edited by J. Lierman. WUNT 2.19. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Falk, Harvey. *Jesus the Pharisee: A New Look at the Jewishness of Jesus*. New York: Paulist Press, 1985.
- Farrell, Shannon-Elizabeth. "Seeing the Father (Jn 6:46, 14:9) Part III: Eschatological Seeing and Memorial Seeing." *Science et Esprit* 4/3 (1992): 307-29.
- Fee, Gordon D. "The Textual Criticism of the New Testament." Page 1:432 in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by F.E. Gaebelein. 12 volumes. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.
- Ferri Rolando. "Witness and Lawyer in the Roman Courts: Linguistic Strategies of Evasiveness and Intimidation in Roman Trial Debates." *Incontri di Filologia Classica* 12 (2012-2013): 57-99.
- Feuillet, P. André. "L'Eucharistie, le Sacrifice du Calvaire et le Sacerdoce du Christ d'après quelques données du quatrième Évangile: Comparaison avec les Synoptiques et l'Épître aux Hébreux." *DCV* 29/2 (1985): 103-49.
- Fife, A.E. "The Legend of the Three Nephites among the Mormons." *JAF* 53/207 (1940): 1-49.

- Fischer, Günter. *Die himmlischen Wohnungen: Untersuchung zu Joh 14,2f.* Bern: Herbert Lang, 1975.
- Fortna, Robert T. "Theological Use of Locale in the Fourth Gospel." *ATR Supplement Series* 3 (1974): 58-95.
- Foster, Paul. "Peter in Noncanonical Traditions." Pages 222-62 in *Peter in Early Christianity*. Edited by H.K. Bond and L. Hurtado. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Fox, Michael A. "The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature." *ZAW* 93 (1981): 416-31.
- Freed, Edwin D. "Variations in the Language and Thought of John." *ZNW* 55 (1964): 167-97.
- . "Jn 1,19-27 in Light of Related Passages in John, the Synoptics, and Acts." Pages 3:1943-61 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100. 3 volumes. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- . "Egō Eimi in John 1:20 and 4:25." *CBQ* 58/4 (2004): 376-85.
- Frey, Jörg. *Die johanneische Eschatologie*. WUNT 96, 110, 117. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997, 1998, 2000.
- . "Eschatology in the Johannine Circle." Pages 47-84 in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by G. van Belle, J.G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz. BETL 184. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- . "Die Gegenwart von Vergangenheit und Zukunft Christi: Zur 'Verschmelzung' der Zeithorizonte im Johannesevangelium." Pages 132-58 in *Zeit*. Edited by M. Ebner et al. JBTh 28. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie, 2014.
- Friedman, Richard Elliott. *The Hidden Face of God*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1997.
- Friesen, Courtney J.P. "Dionysus as Jesus: The Incongruity of a Love Feast in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* 2.2." *HTR* 107/2 (2014): 222-40.
- Funk, Robert W. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988.
- Gaebel, Robert E. "The Greek Word-Lists to Vergil and Cicero." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 52/2 (1970): 284-325.

- Gardner-Smith, Percival. *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- . "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew." *JTS* 4/1 (1953): 31-35.
- Garský, Zbyněk. *Das Wirken Jesu in Galiläa bei Johannes*. WUNT 2.325. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Gerhard, John J. *The Miraculous Parallelisms of John: A Golden Mold of Symmetric Patterns*. Tangerine: Orlando Truth, 2006.
- Glasson, T. Francis. "Inaccurate Repetitions in the Fourth Gospel." *ExpT* 57 (1946): 111-12.
- Goldberg, Larry. *A Commentary on Plato's Protagoras*. American University Studies 5/1; New York: Peter Lang, 1983.
- Goodwin, Charles. "How Did John Treat His Sources?" *JBL* 73/2 (1954): 61-75.
- Gordis, Robert. "Quotations in Wisdom Literature." *JQR* 30/2 (1939): 123-47.
- . "Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental, and Rabbinic Literature." *HUCA* 22 (1949): 157-219.
- . "Psalm 9-10: A Textual and Exegetical Study." *JQR* 48/2 (1957): 104-22.
- . *Koheleth: The Man and His World*. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.
- Goulder, Michael D. "John 1,1-2,12 and the Synoptics" Pages 201-37 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by A. Denaux. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Gourbillon, J.-G. "La parabole du serpent d'airain." *RB* 51 (1942): 213-26.
- Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt, editors. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. 80 volumes. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898-2008.
- Grese, William C. "'Unless One Is Born Again': The Use of the Heavenly Journey in John 3." *JBL* 107/4 (1988): 677-93.
- Griffith, Terry. "'The Jews Who Had Believed in Him' (John 8:31) and the Motif of Apostasy in the Gospel of John." Pages 183-92 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by R. Bauckham and C. Mosser; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

- Grigsby, Bruce. "Washing in the Pool of Siloam: A Thematic Anticipation of the Johannine Cross." *NovT* 27/3 (1985): 227-35.
- Grube, G.M.A., translator. *Plato: Five Dialogues*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1981.
- Guilding, Aileen. *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960.
- Gundry, Robert H. "In My Father's House Are Many *Monai* (John 14:2)." *ZNW* 58 (1967): 68-72.
- Hall, Edith. "Lawcourt Dramas: Acting and Performance in Legal Oratory." *BICS* 40/1 (1995): 39-58.
- Hall, Robert. "Arguing Like an Apocalypse: Galatians and an Ancient *Topos* Outside the Greco-Roman Rhetorical Tradition." *NTS* 42/3 (1996): 434-53.
- Harvey, A.E. *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Hatina, Thomas R. "Who Will See 'The Kingdom of God Coming with Power' in Mark 9,1—Protagonists or Antagonists?" *Biblica* 86/1 (2005): 20-34.
- Heath, Jane. "'You Say that I Am a King' (John 18.37)." *JSNT* 34/3 (2012): 232-53.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm. "Das Evangelium des Johannes." Pages 2:685-861 in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by J. Weiss. 2 volumes. 2nd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1908.
- Hillers, Delbert R. "Micah." Pages 4:807-10 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. General editor D.N. Freedman. 6 volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Hock, Ronald F. "General Introduction to Volume I." Pages 3-47 in *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric Volume I: The Progymnasmata*. Edited by R.F. Hock and E.N. O'Neil. Texts and Translations 27/Greco-Roman Religion Series 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- . "Why New Testament Scholars Should Read Ancient Novels." Pages 121-38 in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*. Edited by R.F. Hock, J.B. Chance, and J. Perkins. SBL Symposium Series 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Hock, Ronald F. and Edward N. O'Neil, editors. *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric Volume I: The Progymnasmata*. Texts and Translations 27/Greco-Roman Religion Series 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Hoffmann, Gerhard. *Das Johannesevangelium als Alterswerk: Eine psychologische Untersuchung*. Neutestamentliche Forschungen 4/1. Gütersloh, 1933.

- Hollander, Harm W. "The Words of Jesus from Oral Traditions to Written Record in Paul and Q." *NovT* 42/4 (2000): 340-57.
- Holloway, Paul A. "Left Behind: Jesus' Consolation of His Disciples in John 13,31-17,26." *ZNW* 96 (2005): 1-34.
- Holwerda, David E. *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in the Gospel of John: A Critique of Rudolf Bultmann's Present Eschatology*. Kampen: Kok, 1959.
- Hooker, Morna D. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. BNTC 2. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.
- Horwitz, William J. "Audience Reaction to Jeremiah." *CBQ* 32 (1970): 555-64.
- Hoskins, Paul M. *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn C. *The Fourth Gospel*. London: Faber & Faber, 1967.
- Hunn, Debbie. "Who Are 'They' in John 8:33?" *CBQ* 66/3 (2004): 387-99.
- Hunt, Steven A. "And the Word Became Flesh—Again? Jesus and Abraham in John 8:31-59." Pages 81-109 in *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham: Essays in Honor of Marvin R. Wilson*. Edited by S.A. Hunt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch." Pages 1:5-89 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. 2 volumes. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Jennings, Mark. "The Fourth Gospel's Reversal of Mark in John 13,31-14,3." *Biblica* 94/2 (2013): 210-36.
- Johnson, Daniel B. "A Neglected Variant in Gregory 33 (John V.8)." *NTS* 18/2 (1972): 231-32.
- Johnstone, Barbara, et al. "Repetition in Discourse: A Dialogue." Pages 1:1-20 in *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by B. Johnstone. 2 volumes. Norwood: Ablex Publishing, 1994.
- Kammler, Hans-Christian. *Christologie und Eschatologie: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Joh 5,17-30*. WUNT 126. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Kanagaraj, Jey J. *'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background*. JSNTSup 158. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.

- Käsemann, Ernst. *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in Light of Chapter 17*. Translated by G. Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Kaster, Robert A., editor and translator. *Suetonius: De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Keener, Craig S. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- . *The Gospel of John*. 2 volumes. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Keiser, Thomas A. "The Song of Moses a Basis for Isaiah's Prophecy." *VT* 50/4 (2005): 486-500.
- Kennedy, George A. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Kerr, Alan R. *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. JSNTSup 220. London: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Kessler, John A. "The Shaking of the Nations: An Eschatological View." *JETS* 30/2 (1987): 159-66.
- Kim, Margaret G. *Marking Thought in New Testament Greek: New Light from Linguistics on the Particles ἵνα and ὅτι*. Eugene: Pickwick, 2010.
- Korteweg, Theodore. "The Reality of the Invisible: Some Remarks on St John XIV 8 and Greek Philosophic Tradition." Pages 50-102 in *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*. Edited by M.J. Vermaseren. EPROER 78. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- . "'You Will Seek Me and You Will not Find Me' (Jn 7,34): An Apocalyptic Pattern in Johannine Theology." Pages 349-54 in *L'Apocalypse johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by J. Lambrecht. BETL 53. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Kysar, Robert. "The Eschatology of the Fourth Gospel: A Correction of Bultmann's Redactional Hypothesis." *Perspective* 13/1 (1972): 23-33.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. *Évangile selon Saint Jean*. 8th edition. Paris: Gabalda, 1948.
- Lambdin, Thomas O. "The Gospel of Thomas (II, 2)." Pages 117-30 in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. Edited by J.M. Robinson. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

- Laufer, Catherine. "The Farewell Discourse in John's Gospel as a Commentary on the Seder Service." *Colloquium* 27/2 (1995): 147-60.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. "Der Vers J 1,27 des Johannes-Evangeliums: Rhetorische Befunde zu Form und Sinn des Textes." *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I, Philologisch-historische Klasse* 6 (1984): 3-16.
- . *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Edited by D.E. Orton and R.D. Anderson. Boston: Brill, 1998.
- Lee, Dorothy. "The Gospel of John and the Five Senses." *JBL* 129/1 (2010): 115-27.
- . "Witness in the Fourth Gospel: John the Baptist and the Beloved Disciple as Counterparts." *ABR* 61 (2013): 1-17.
- Légasse, S. "Le retour du Christ d'après l'évangile de Jean, chapitre 14 et 16: Une adaptation du motif de la Parousie." *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 81 (1980): 161-74.
- LeGrand, P.-E., editor and translator. *Histoires*. 5th edition. 9 volumes. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930-1954.
- Leroy, Herbert. *Rätsel und Missverständnis: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums*. BBB 30. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1968.
- Létourneau, Pierre. "Le Quatrième Évangile et les predications de la passion dans les Évangiles Synoptiques." Pages 579-86 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by A. Denaux. BETL 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. "ὄρι *Recitativum* in John's Gospel: A Stylistic or a Pragmatic Device?" *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota* 43 (1999): 1-14, accessed at http://arts-sciences.und.edu/summer-institute-of-linguistics/work-papers/_files/docs/1999-levinsohn.pdf, January 17, 2016.
- Lewis, R.G. "The Procedural Basis of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 30/1 (1989): 41-66.
- Licht, Jacob. *Storytelling in the Bible*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1978.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000.
- . *The Gospel According to Saint John*. BNTC 4; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.

- Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- . "Discourse and Tradition: The Use of the Sayings of Jesus in the Discourse of the Fourth Gospel." *JSNT* 13 (1981): 83-101.
- . "John and the Synoptic Gospels: A Test Case." *NTS* 29 (1981): 287-94.
- Little, Charles E. *The Institutio Oratoria of Marcus Fabius Quintilianus*. 2 volumes. Nashville: Peabody, 1951.
- Louw, J.P. and E.A. Nida, editors. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Lupieri, Edmondo. *Giovanni Battista fra storia e leggenda*. Biblioteca di cultura religiosa 53. Brescia: Paideia, 1988.
- . *A Commentary on the Apocalypse of John*. Translated by M.P. Johnson and A. Kamesar. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- MacDowell, Douglas M., editor and translator. *Demosthenes: Against Meidias (Oration 21)*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Manns, Frédéric. "Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse Johannique." *RB* 92/4 (1985): 525-38
- Mardaga, Hellen. "The Repetitive Use of ὑψόω in the Fourth Gospel." *CBQ* 74/1 (2012): 101-17.
- Martin, Troy. "Apostasy to Paganism: The Rhetorical Stasis of the Galatian Controversy." *JBL* 114/3 (1995): 437-61.
- . "Animals Impregnated by the Wind and Mary's Pregnancy by the Holy Spirit." *ASE* 31/2 (2014): 11-24.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians*. AB 33A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- . *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 3rd edition. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Matson, Mark. "The Influence of John on Luke's Passion: Toward a Theory of Intergospel Dialogue." Pages 183-94 in *Für und wider die Priorität des Johannesevangeliums: Symposion in Salzburg am 10. März 2000*. Edited by P.N. Anderson and P.L. Hofrichter. Theologische Texte und Studien 9. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2002.

- Matthews, Mark D. "The Function of Imputed Speech in the Apocalypse of John." *CBQ* 74/2 (2012): 319-38.
- McCaffrey, James. *The House with Many Rooms: The Temple Theme of Jn. 14,2-3*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. NovTSup 14; Boston: Brill, 1967.
- . "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism." *JBL* 91/1 (1972): 44-72.
- Mehlman, John. "John 8,48 in Some Patristic Quotations." *Biblica* 44 (1963): 206-9.
- Mendez, Hugo. "'Night' and 'Day' in John 9.4-5: A Reassessment." *NTS* 61/4 (2015): 468-81.
- Menken, M.J.J. "Die Form des Zitates aus Jes 6,10 in Joh 12,40." *BZ* 32 (1988): 189-209.
- . *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Kampen: Pharos, 1996.
- Michaels, J. Ramsay. "Origen and the Text of John 1:15." Pages 87-104 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis*. Edited by E.J. Epp and G.D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Migne, Jacques-Paul, ed. *Patrologiae Graecae*. 161 volumes. Paris: 1857-1866.
- Miller, Paul A. and Charles Platter. *Plato's Apology of Socrates: A Commentary*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010.
- Miura, Nozomi. "'My Father's House' (*Familia Dei*): A Network of 'Family' Metaphors in the Fourth Gospel." *AJBI* 39 (2013): 21-63.
- Mlakuzhyil, George. *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. SacPag 4; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- . "The Gospel of John as Scripture." *CBQ* 67/3 (2005): 454-68.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge Classical Studies; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Morland, Kjell Arne. *The Rhetoric of Curse in Galatians: Paul Confronts Another Gospel*. ESEC 5. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2005.

- Morris, Leon. *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.
- Moule, C.F.D. "A Neglected Factor in the Interpretation of Johannine Eschatology." Pages 155-60 in *Studies in John: Presented to Professor Dr. J.N. Sevenster on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by A.S. Geyser. NovTSup 24. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Myers, Alicia D. "Prosopopoetics and Conflict: Speech and Expectations in John 8." *Biblica* 92/4 (2011): 580-96.
- . "'Jesus Said to Them...': The Adaptation of Juridicial Rhetoric in John 5:19-47." *JBL* 132/2 (2013): 415-30.
- Nardoni, Enrique. "A Redactional Interpretation of Mark 9:1." *CBQ* 43/3 (1981): 365-84.
- Neiryneck, Frans. "L'épanalepsis et la critique littéraire: À propos de l'évangile de Jean." *ETL* 56/4 (1980): 303-38.
- . "John 5,1-18 and the Gospel of Mark: A Response to P. Borgen." Pages 699-712 in *Evangelica II*. BETL 99. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. "Jesus the Judge: Forensic Process in John 8:21-59." *Biblica* 68/4 (1987): 509-42.
- . "The Trials (Forensic) and Tribulations (Honor Challenges) of Jesus: John 7 in Social Scientific Perspective." *BTB* 26/3 (1996): 107-24.
- . *The Gospel of John*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Nida, Eugene A. *Style and Discourse: With Special Reference to the Text of the Greek New Testament*. Cape Town: BSSA, 1983.
- Noack, Bent. *Zur johanneischen Tradition: Beiträge zur Kritik an der literarischen Analyse des vierten Evangeliums*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1954.
- O'Day, Gail R. "'I Have Said These Things to You...': The Unsettled Place of Jesus' Discourses in Literary Approaches to the Fourth Gospel." Pages 147-52 in *Word, Theology, and Community in John*. Edited by J. Painter, R.A. Culpepper, and F.F. Segovia. St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2002.
- O'Neil, Edward N. "Discussion of Preliminary Exercises of Marcus Fabius Quintilianus." Pages 113-38 in *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric Volume I: The Progymnasmata*. Edited by R.F. Hock and E.N. O'Neil. Texts and Translations 27/Greco-Roman Religion Series 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

- Osburn, Carroll D. "Some Exegetical Observations on John 3:5-8." *Restoration Quarterly* 31 (1989): 129-38.
- Pamment, Margaret. "Eschatology and the Fourth Gospel." *JSNT* 15 (1982): 81-85.
- Pancaro, Severino. "'People of God' in St John's Gospel." *NTS* 16/2 (1970): 114-29.
- . *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Parker, Floyd O. "'Our Lord and God' in Rev 4,11: Evidence for the Late Date of Revelation?" *Biblica* 82/2 (2001): 207-31.
- Parsenios, George L. *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif*. WUNT 258. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Patillon, Michael, editor and translator. *Aelius Théon: Progymnasmata*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997.
- . *Pseudo-Aelius Aristide: Arts Rhétoriques: Le Discours Politique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002.
- Paz, Yakir. *From Scribes to Scholars: Rabbinic Biblical Exegesis in Light of Homeric Commentaries*. Ph.D. dissertation (Hebrew). Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2014.
- Pazdan, Mary Margaret. "Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Modes of Discipleship." *BTB* 17/4 (1987): 145-48.
- Perrin, Nicholas and Christopher W. Skinner. "Recent Trends in *Gospel of Thomas* Research (1989-2011). Part II: Genre, Theology, and Relationship to the Gospel of John." *CBR* 11/1 (2012): 65-86.
- Popp, Thomas. *Grammatik des Geistes: Literarische Kunst und theologische Konzeption in Johannes 3 und 6*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2001.
- . "Die Kunst der Wiederholung: Repetition, Variation und Amplifikation im vierten Evangelium am Beispiel von Joh 6,60-71." Pages 559-62 in *Kontexte des Johannes-evangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditions-geschichtlicher Perspektive*. Edited by J. Frey and U. Schnelle. WUNT 175. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. BLG 2; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.

- Preiss, Théo. "Justification in Johannine Thought." Pages 9-31 in *Life in Christ*. Naperville: A.R. Allenson, 1957.
- Pryor, John W. "John 3.3, 5. A Study in the Relationship of John's Gospel to the Synoptic Tradition." *JSNT* 41 (1991): 71-95.
- Quan, Keith A. "The Inscriptured Word: The Fourth Gospel as the Continuing Speech of the Incarnate Word." *JTI* 5/1 (2011): 49-68.
- Quek, Tze-Ming. "A Text-Critical Study of John 1.34." *NTS* 55/1 (2009): 22-34.
- Reid, Barbara. "Between Text & Sermon: John 7:37-39." *Interpretation* 63/4 (2009): 394-96.
- Reinhartz, Adele. "John 8:31-59 from a Jewish Perspective." Pages 2:787-97 in *Remembering for the Future: The Holocaust in an Age of Genocide*. Edited by J.K. Roth and E. Maxwell-Meynard. 3 volumes. London: Palgrave, 2001.
- Rensberger, David. "The Politics of John: The Trial of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 103/3 (1984): 395-411.
- . "The Messiah Who Has Come into the World: The Message of the Gospel of John." Pages 15-23 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*. Translated by J. Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Robinson, J.A.T. "Elijah, John, and Jesus: An Essay in Detection." *NTS* 4/4 (1958): 263-81.
- Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg. *The Critical Edition of Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Robinson, James M. and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Rodgers, Peter R. "The Text of John 1:34." Pages 299-305 in *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs*. Edited by C. Seitz and K. Greene-McCreight. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Rogers, Trent A. "A Syntactical Analysis of οὐν in Papyrus 66." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 25 (2012): 75-99.

- Rordorf, Willy. "La vigne et le vin dans la tradition juive et chrétienne." Pages 493-508 in *Liturgie, Foi et Vie des Premiers Chrétiens*. TH 75. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.
- Sanders, J.N. and B.A. Mastin. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Sandnes, Karl O. "Whence and Whither: A Narrative Perspective on Birth ἄνωθεν (John 3,3-8)." *Biblica* 86/2 (2005): 153-73.
- Savran, George W. "The Character as Narrator in Biblical Narrative." *ProofTexts* 5/1 (Special Issue on Storytelling, 1985): 1-17.
- . *Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative*. ISBL. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Sawyer, Deborah. "Water and Blood: Birthing Images in John's Gospel." Pages 300-9 in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*. Edited by W.G.E. Watson, J. Davies, and G. Harvey. JSOTSupp 195. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Schenke, Ludger. "Der 'Dialog Jesu mit den Juden' im Johannesevangelium: Ein Rekonstruktionsversuch." *NTS* 34 (1988): 573-603.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt: Ein Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium*. 2nd edition. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1948.
- Schlosser, Jacques. "Les logia johanniques relatifs au Père." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 69/1 (1995): 87-104.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 volumes. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Schneiders, Sandra M. *Written that You May Believe: Encountering Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1999.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. THNT 4. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1988.
- Schökel, Luis Alonso. "Las sandalias del mesías esposo: Simbolos del Antiguo Testamento como lenguaje del Nuevo Testamento." *Cuadernos de Teología* 5/3 (1978): 198-210.

- Scholtissek, Klaus. *In Ihm sein und bleiben: Die Sprache der Immanenz in den Johanneischen Schriften*. HBS 21. New York: Herder, 2000.
- . "Mündiger Glaube. Zur Architektur und Pragmatik johanneischer be-
gegnungsgeschichten: Joh 5 und 9." Pages 75-105 in *Paulus und Johannes: Exegetische Studien zur paulinischen und johanneischen Theologie und Literatur*. Edited by D. Sänger und U. Mell. WUNT 198. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. SBLDS 133. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992.
- Schulze, Johann D. *Der schriftstellerische Charakter und Werth des Johannes, zum Behuf Specialhermeneutik seiner Schriften den untersucht und bestimmt: voran ein Nach-trag über die Quellen der Briefe von Petrus, Jakobus und Judas, und über das Verhältniss dieser Briefe zu andern neutestamentlichen Schriften*. 2nd edition. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1811.
- Schwartz, Sandra. "Clitophon the *Moichos*: Achilles Tatius and the Trial Scene in the Greek Novel." *Ancient Narrative* 1 (2001): 93-113.
- Segovia, Fernando F. "Review of *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*." *CBQ* 51 (1989): 749-50.
- . *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Sesonske, Alexander. "To Make the Weaker Argument the Stronger." *JHP* 6 (1968): 217-31.
- Sévrin, Jean-Marie. "La fin et le temps dans l'évangile selon Jean." *Revue d'Éthique et de Théologie Morale (Supplement)* 207 (1998): 101-24.
- Shafer, Grant R. "The Divinization of the Blind Man: 'Εγὼ εἰμὶ in John 9:9." *Proceedings* 25 (2005): 157-67.
- Shellard, Barbara. *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*. JSNTSup 215. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Skinner, Christopher W. "'Son of God' or 'God's Chosen One' (John 1:34)? A Narrative-Critical Solution to a Text-Critical Problem." *BBR* 25/3 (2015): 341-57.
- Smith, D. Moody. *John among the Gospels: The Relationship in Twentieth-Century Research*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

- Snyder, Graydon F. "John 13:16 and the Anti-Petrinism of the Johannine Tradition." *BR* 16 (1971): 5-15.
- Sparks, H.F.D. "St. John's Knowledge of Matthew: The Evidence of John 13,16 and 15,20." *JTS* 3/1 (1952): 58-61.
- Sproston North, Wendy. "'Lord, If You Had Been Here...' (John 11.21): The Absence of Jesus and Strategies of Consolation in the Fourth Gospel." *JSNT* 36/1 (2013): 39-52.
- Stange, Erich. *Die Eigenart der johanneischen Produktion: Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der neueren Quellenscheidungshypothesen und zur Charakteristik der johanneischen Psyche*. Dresden, 1915.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. "Abschiedsreden." *RAC* 1 (1950): 29-35.
- . *New Testament Theology*. London: SCM, 1955.
- Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels*. London: MacMillan, 1926.
- Stube, John Carlson. *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse*. LNTS 309. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Suleiman, Susan. "Redundancy and the 'Readable' Text." *Poetics Today* 1/3 (1980): 119-42.
- Swancutt, Diana M. "Hungers Assuage by the Bread from Heaven: 'Eating Jesus' as Isaian Call to Belief—the Confluence of Isaiah 55 and Psalm 78 (77) in John 6.22-71." Pages 218-51 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Thatcher, Tom. *The Riddles of Jesus in John: A Study in Tradition and Folklore*. SBLMS 53. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- . "The Riddles of Jesus in the Johannine Dialogues." Pages 263-80 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- . *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.

- . "Riddles, Repetitions, and the Literary Unity of the Johannine Discourses." Pages 357-77 in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, Interpretation*. Edited by G. Van Belle, M. Labahn, and P. Maritz. BETL 223. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009.
- Theobald, Michael. *Herrenworte im Johannesevangelium*. HBS 34. Freiberg: Herder, 2002.
- Thyen, Hartwig. *Das Johannesevangelium*. HNT 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Tolmie, D.F. "The Rhetorical Analysis of the Letter to the Galatians: 1995-2005." *Acta Theologica Supplementum* 9 (2007): 1-28.
- Tovey, Derek. *Narrative Art and Act in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTSup 151. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Tripp, Jeffrey M. "A Revelation from Gabriel to Nathan? The Herodian Temple and the Ideology of the Davidic Covenant in the *Hazon Gabriel*." *ASE* 31/1 (2014): 7-27.
- Trocmé, Étienne. "Jean et les Synoptiques: L'Exemple de Jean 1,15-34." Pages 3:1935-41 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100. 3 volumes. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Turner, C.H. "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel (VII)." *JThS* 28 (1926): 9-30.
- Twelftree, Graham H. *Jesus the Exorcist*. WUNT 2.54. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.
- . "Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics." Pages 135-43 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by R.T. Fortna and T. Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Van Belle, Gilbert. *Les parenthèses dans l'évangile de Jean: Aperçu historique et classification. Texte grec de Jean*. SNTA 11. Leuven: Leuven University, 1985.
- . "L'accomplissement de la parole de Jésus: La parenthèse de Jn 18,9." Pages 515-21 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C.M. Tuckett. BETL 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987.
- Van Belle, Gilbert and David R. M. Godecharle. "C.H. Dodd on John 13:16 (and 15:20): St. John's Knowledge of Matthew Revisited." Pages 86-106 in *Engaging with C.H. Dodd on the Gospel of John: Sixty Years of Tradition and Interpretation*. Edited by T. Thatcher and C.H. Williams. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

- Van den Heever, Gerhard A. "John the Baptist and the Pre-Existence of Jesus in the Gospel of John: The Social Rhetoric of Pre-Existence Pronouncements in John 1:15, 27, 30." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 20 (2009): 45-76.
- Van der Watt, Jan. "Double Entendre in the Gospel According to John." Pages 463-81 in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by G. van Belle, J.G. van der Watt, and P. Maritz. BETL 184. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- . "Eschatology in John: A Continuous Process of Realizing Events." Pages 109-40 in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents*. Edited by J.G. van der Watt. WUNT 2.315. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Van Hartingsveld, Lodewijk. *Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit R. Bultmann*. VGTB 36. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962.
- Von Spengel, Leonhard. *Rhetores Graeci*. 3 volumes. Leipzig: Teubner, 1856.
- Von Wahlde, Urban C. "Redactional Technique in the Fourth Gospel." *CBQ* 38/4 (1976): 520-33.
- . "The Witnesses to Jesus in John 5:31-40 and Belief in the Fourth Gospel." *CBQ* 43/3 (1981): 385-404.
- . "Literary Structure and Theological Argument in Three Discourses with the Jews in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 103/4 (1984): 575-84.
- . *The Gospel and Letters of John*. 3 volumes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- . *The Basics of New Testament Syntax: An Intermediate Greek Grammar*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Walsh, Jerome T. *Old Testament Narrative: A Guide to Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009.
- Walters, Patricia. *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*. SNTS 145. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Watson, Duane F. "Amplification Techniques in 1 John: The Interaction of Rhetorical Style and Invention." *JSNT* 51 (1993): 99-123.

- Wead, David W. "The Johannine Double Meaning." *Restoration Quarterly* 13/2 (1970): 106-20.
- Webster, E.C. "Pattern in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 230-57 in *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*. Edited by D.J.A. Clines, D.M. Gunn, and A.J. Hauser. JSOTSup 19. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1982.
- Weidemann, Hans-Ulrich. "Eschatology as Liturgy: Jesus' Resurrection and Johannine Eschatology." Pages 277-310 in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Edited by R. Bieringer and C.R. Koester. WUNT 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008.
- Welch, John W. "Chiasmus in the New Testament." Pages 211-49 in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Edited by J.W. Welch. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Das Evangelium Johannis*. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1908.
- Westcott, B.F. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Whitmarsh, Tim, translator. *Leucippe and Clitophon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. NTD 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Wilke, Christian G. *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik, ein Seitenstück zur Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. Dresden-Leipzig, 1843.
- Willemse, J.J.C. *Het vierde evangelie: Een onderzoek naar zijn structuur*. Hilversum: Brand, 1965.
- . "La patrie de Jesus selon Saint Jean IV.44." *NTS* 11/4 (1965): 349-64.
- Williams, Francis E. "Fourth Gospel and Synoptic Tradition: Two Johannine Passages." *JBL* 86/3 (1967): 311-19.
- Wilson, J. Christian. "The Problem of the Domitianic Date of Revelation." *NTS* 39/4 (2009): 587-605.
- Wilson, Jeffrey. "The Integrity of John 3:22-36." *JSNT* 10 (1981): 34-41.
- Wilson, Mark. "The Early Christians in Ephesus and the Date of Revelation, Again." *Neotestamentica* 39/1 (2005): 169-200.

Witherup, Ronald D. "Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles: A Case Study." *JSNT* 48 (1992): 67-86.

----. "Cornelius Over and Over and Over Again: 'Functional Redundancy' in the Acts of the Apostles." *JSNT* 49 (1993): 45-66.

Woll, D. Bruce. "The Departure of 'The Way': The First Farewell Discourse in the Gospel of John." *JBL* 99/2 (1980): 225-39.

Yarbro Collins, Adela. "The Genre of the Passion Narrative." *ST* 47 (1993): 3-28.

Zorilla, C. Hugo. "The Obedient Disciple: Agent of Liberation (John 8:31-32)." Pages 17-33 in *Freedom and Discipleship: Liberation Theology in Anabaptist Perspective*. Edited by D.S. Schipani. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1989.

Zumstein, Jean. "Jesus' Resurrection in the Farewell Discourses." Pages 103-26 in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Edited by R. Bieringer and C.R. Koester. WUNT 222. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008.

VITA

Jeffrey (Jef) M. Tripp was born and raised in the suburbs of Detroit, Michigan. He attended Michigan State University, earning a Bachelor of Arts in Mathematics as a member of the Honors College (2000). In his final year, he received recognition as the Undergraduate Teaching Assistant of the Year from the Department of Mathematics. Dr. Tripp taught high school mathematics before pursuing biblical studies as a profession. He received a Master of Arts in Religion from the University of Georgia (2010), with honors.

Dr. Tripp was awarded the Cody Fellowship at Loyola University Chicago, which allowed him to continue working in education as Teaching Assistant to Edmondo F. Lupieri, and to participate in many academic seminars and colloquia hosted by the John Cardinal Cody Chair in Theology. Dr. Tripp has been an active member of the Chicago Society of Biblical Research, the Catholic Biblical Association, and the Society of Biblical Literature. He has presented research at the regional and national meetings of the SBL. Dr. Tripp has also published several articles in peer-reviewed journals on biblical literature directly, and on the influence of biblical themes on modern narratives. Currently Dr. Tripp teaches classes at Loyola University Chicago, and tutors mathematics at Malcolm X College.